

IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

COUNTY OF KITTITAS

KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY)
COMMISSIONERS SPECIAL MEETING)
RE KITTITAS VALLEY WIND POWER)
PROJECT)

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

January 11, 2006
7:00 p.m.
Kittitas County Fairgrounds
Ellensburg, Washington

JOINT HEARING BEFORE
THE KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
AND
THE KITTITAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

REPORTED BY:
LOUISE R. BELL, CCR NO. 2676

1 APPEARANCES:

2 KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS:

3 COMMISSIONER DAVID BOWEN, Chairman

COMMISSIONER ALAN CRANKOVICH

4 COMMISSIONER PERRY HUSTON

5 KITTITAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION:

6 COMMISSIONER DAVID BLACK, Chairman

COMMISSIONER DOUG HARRIS

7 COMMISSIONER MARK McCLAIN

COMMISSIONER SCOTT PERNA

8 COMMISSIONER GRANT CLARK

COMMISSIONER DON WILLIAMSON

1 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Good evening. It's
2 Wednesday, January 11, 2006, 7:00 p.m. at the
3 Kittitas County Events Center.

4 We're here for an open-record hearing -- a
5 continued open-record hearing before the Kittitas
6 County Board of County Commissioners and the
7 Kittitas County Planning Commission to consider
8 the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project submitted
9 by the Sagebrush Power Partners, LLC, for siting
10 of a maximum of 80 wind turbines and associated
11 facilities at a site located approximately
12 12 miles northwest of the city of Ellensburg.

13 I've got a few record-keeping issues.
14 Gentlemen, first of all, so I don't forget, why
15 don't we go through any declarations over the
16 last, I don't know, 24 hours, I guess, or less.

17 My only contact has been some procedural
18 questions with Chief Deputy Prosecutor Hurson
19 regarding how tonight would go. And that would
20 be the extent of my declarations.

21 So with that said, does anyone object to my
22 continuing to sit in hearing on this project?

23 Hearing no objections, Commissioner
24 Crankovich.

25 COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: I have no

1 declarations since last we met.

2 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Hearing that, does anyone
3 object to Commissioner Crankovich continuing to
4 sit in hearing on this project?

5 Hearing none, Commissioner Huston.

6 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: No contacts, no new
7 information other than that which is on our
8 table.

9 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: With that said, does anyone
10 object to Commissioner Huston continuing to sit
11 in hearing on this project?

12 Hearing none, all commissioners will remain
13 seated.

14 Once again I'll go through a few of the
15 reminders. Cell phones, please, silent or
16 vibrate, if you would. Tonight we anticipate
17 will probably be be filled with public testimony
18 most of the evening, if not all of it, and we
19 understand that and will expect that and
20 appreciate that.

21 We will check again about ten o'clock, see
22 where we're at; and if we need to continue, we'll
23 continue. If we're at a spot that makes sense to
24 stop, we'll probably stop somewhere in that
25 vicinity, 10:00, 10:30.

1 We have one personnel change that I'm aware
2 of. That would be Mandy Weed is serving as clerk
3 for the Planning Commission tonight in place of
4 Susan Barret, if I remember correctly.

5 And I think staff wanted to make a couple of
6 comments before we got going. I don't know if we
7 need to bring the Planning Commission up in the
8 meeting first before those comments or not.

9 MR. PIERCY: That would probably be the
10 appropriate thing to do, Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I'll turn it over to
12 Chairman Black.

13 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you, Chairman Bowen.
14 Let me introduce the Planning Commission. Third
15 from my right is Grant Clark. Second from my
16 right is Scott Perna. Immediately to my right
17 is Mark McClain. To -- second man is Don
18 Williamson on my left, and Doug Harris next to
19 me. I'm David Black, and I am Planning
20 Commission chairman.

21 I think that we should go through any
22 updates on contacts. I have had absolutely no
23 additional contacts other than I disclosed last
24 evening. Nothing any further.

25 Is there anyone in the audience that wishes

1 to object to my serving on this board?

2 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: I do.

3 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Name.

4 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Speaking as an
5 individual --

6 Mark Holloway, 1581 Thomas Road.

7 I am a little -- I'm concerned from previous
8 statements about -- since you're the chairman of
9 this committee and this is -- refers to should be
10 fairly impartial or a hundred percent impartial
11 and very neutral. I'm concerned that from your
12 previous statements that you may have problems
13 with the impartiality and also with the fact that
14 you're sitting as the chair.

15 This is about wind generation and the
16 ability for farmers and local people to use wind
17 energy, and -- and as -- as a way to maybe
18 subsidize their farming activities or also, you
19 know, bring in new businesses into our community,
20 into our area. And so it --

21 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Could --

22 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: -- I'm concerned when --

23 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Excuse me, go ahead.

24 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Yeah. I'm concerned
25 when I hear statements that -- like in the 2002

1 hearings that you wanted to ban wind generation
2 in the county.

3 CHAIRMAN BLACK: That's --

4 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Is that incorrect?

5 CHAIRMAN BLACK: That's incorrect. That was
6 an editorial written about wind farms going in
7 the Kittitas Valley. And that project was
8 never -- never came to fruition. It was this
9 same project only it was much, much larger.
10 The -- many more turbines, many things of that
11 type. And that was what I was objecting to.

12 I, I am totally open-minded. I have sat on
13 this board through the Desert Claim, and that was
14 a 7-0 unanimous vote by the Planning Commission
15 to vote no on that, to deny that. The County
16 Commissioners, the Board of County Commissioners
17 also upheld the Planning Commission on that.

18 I voted with Horizon on the Wild Horse.

19 So it isn't that I'm against the wind farms.
20 That project was much, much larger than this
21 project.

22 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay. So you feel --

23 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I'm totally open minded --

24 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay, that's where my
25 concerns come from, because I mean, this is a --

1 that's what this is a forum for --

2 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Absolutely. And I can
3 appreciate your concern from that standpoint.
4 But this was three and a half years ago, a
5 project that was much larger that never came
6 before this board, had nothing to do with this
7 board at that time. We never had an application.
8 It was taken, it was preempted to EFSEC a long
9 time ago.

10 And so I'm totally open-minded. If I didn't
11 feel like I could be open-minded --

12 Now, I have to explain to you, however, that
13 because I don't necessarily vote one way or the
14 other way doesn't mean that I'm not open-minded.
15 You have to understand that.

16 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Yeah, oh, yeah, I mean,
17 I'd feel the same way --

18 CHAIRMAN BLACK: And I can listen to this
19 and I have listened to these people talk, these
20 experts, and I can read this stuff, and I have
21 absolutely no problem with being open-minded.
22 However, I need to look at all of the facts; and
23 if I didn't think that I could be open-minded, I
24 would have resigned years ago.

25 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay, well, if that's

1 what --

2 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I hope that that satisfies
3 you. But if not, I'll ask for a motion from this
4 board or from the Board of County Commissioners
5 to ask whether I should step down.

6 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I'm open-minded. I'm as
8 open-minded as anybody in this room. And we know
9 that some people in this room are not very
10 open-minded.

11 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Sure. I mean, that's
12 the nature of people.

13 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I can vouch for that.

14 But I can tell you, I can assure you that
15 when I wrote that editorial --

16 Now, the other things that I disclosed were
17 mailings that I received that were totally
18 unsolicited. And I think that many of the people
19 in this audience have received unsolicited
20 information. And I don't know whether you have
21 or not. But I have absolutely no problem of
22 listening to all of the testimony and making a
23 vote on that based upon the facts.

24 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Well, that's what I
25 hope. I mean, that's --

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: But because of that --

2 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: -- as a person from this
3 county I think that it's really important that
4 you're sitting in a place that you need to
5 represent us neutrally and with an open mind.

6 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I haven't sat in this
7 position for a long period of time, but I have
8 sat on this Planning Commission board for many,
9 many years. And I have absolutely no problem of
10 looking at all of the facts and making a decision
11 based on those facts.

12 But if you wish me to -- you either have a
13 choice of asking me to ask this board for a
14 motion to have me step down, or you have a right
15 to withdraw your objection.

16 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: And at what time, at
17 what point do I get to make that -- do I have to
18 make that decision right now?

19 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Right now. I'll ask the
20 board right now.

21 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: He hasn't actually made a
22 formal objection, so Mr. Holloway --

23 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: No, I just -- I wanted
24 to bring that up, that --

25 CHAIRMAN BLACK: You don't have to withdraw

1 your objection. That was an either/or.
2 Either I'll ask this board for a motion to step
3 down, or you can withdraw your objection.

4 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: I think we get to the
5 same place. He doesn't have to withdraw his
6 objection.

7 CHAIRMAN BLACK: But I do not intend to
8 not -- to step down, okay? That's my intention,
9 is not to step down. If the boards -- either the
10 Planning Commission board or the Board of County
11 Commissioners asks me to step down, I would do
12 that at that time.

13 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay, well, all I -- all
14 I really want is for your -- use your mind. I
15 mean, start from this point on, not previous -- I
16 mean, if we go by your previous statements,
17 that's kind of like, well, what the heck.

18 CHAIRMAN BLACK: But also this project never
19 came up. This project is --

20 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: The wind project; wind
21 has come up.

22 CHAIRMAN BLACK: But I tried to explain that
23 to you, and I can explain again --

24 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Point of order,
25 Mr. Chairman. Point of order --

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Yes?

2 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: We're getting a little
3 conversational here, and I would suggest if you
4 keep the record clean -- recording this is going
5 to be a fascinating project at some point in the
6 future.

7 Mr. Holloway has explained the nature of his
8 objection. If he has additional information, I
9 would take that. You've already rendered your
10 decision that you would not step down. I think
11 we should move ahead with that.

12 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: That's fine.

13 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: In other words,
14 Mr. Holloway --

15 Sorry, Commissioner Bowen over here. I
16 forget you can't tell who's speaking.

17 If you -- at this point, if you're
18 willing -- if you're accepting his explanation
19 and his statement as factual and okay with you,
20 you can withdraw your objection. Or if you don't
21 want to withdraw your objection, then we have
22 other --

23 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: But I can choose to
24 read -- withdraw my objection in the future? Or
25 do I have to --

1 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: You would have to do it
2 right now. For us to proceed tonight we have to
3 take care of that right now.

4 MR. HURSON: Mr. Chairman, Jim Hurson,
5 Deputy Prosecutor.

6 Technically he doesn't have to withdraw,
7 just so you know. He can make his objection for
8 the record, and then there can be an action. So
9 he isn't really compelled to do anything.

10 I would want to add some context, though,
11 because when this came up last night, I've been
12 involved in various stages of this as we've gone
13 through. As I -- I was trying to recall myself
14 what the initial discussions were back in '02 as
15 to what had occurred.

16 And then it dawned on me this evening. I
17 looked in my old files and there was some
18 pretrial testimony in the EFSEC process back when
19 there was a request for production, which there
20 isn't anymore. And it was some testimony of
21 Chris Taylor, Exhibit 20, in the EFSEC process,
22 and this may just give some context of the time
23 frame.

24 Because in 2004, Mr. Taylor's testimony on
25 Page 8 and 9 said, "The Kittitas Valley Wind

1 Power Project is a major project for Kittitas
2 County. Since proposing the project nearly three
3 years ago, we have worked to provide answers and
4 solutions to issues raised by the public and
5 county officials. For example, leading experts
6 to conduct studies on everything from wildlife to
7 noise. We produced visual simulations and made
8 significant modifications, including removing
9 turbines entirely from Lookout Mountain (one of
10 the best wind resources there is in the valley)
11 in response to suggestions. The overall project
12 was reduced from some 16,000 acres to just over
13 7000 acres."

14 And so as I understood the testimony from
15 2004 when they were initially discussing this in
16 2002, it was including the location of Lookout
17 Mountain and the 16,000-acre-plus area. There
18 was an application made to the County in '03
19 which had a certain arrangement, and then we have
20 a new application now which has fewer turbines in
21 a more consolidated location.

22 So it's a different -- it's in essence a
23 different location, different number of turbines.
24 And so I was trying to find some objective piece
25 of paper other than my memory as to what were

1 people hearing or thinking or looking at back in
2 '02 with regards to what we have --

3 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: And you're looking at
4 this as a hundred percent different --

5 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Exactly.

6 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN BLACK: But I would like to clarify
8 something, that I did vote with the rest of the
9 Board of -- the Planning Commission on Desert
10 Claim and I voted for the Wild Horse project. So
11 I don't think it's quite fair to characterize me
12 as anti-wind farm. Because it's a one-and-one.

13 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay?

15 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: I appreciate that.
16 Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I would -- I will ask
18 the -- this board to make a motion to have me
19 step down, however.

20 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: That's your --

21 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I'm asking them right now,
22 this board, the Planning Commission board to make
23 a motion to have me step down if they wish me to
24 step down.

25 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Not hearing one, no motion
2 was made; therefore I will stay as chairman.

3 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay, well, I'm still
4 reserving -- as I have the right to reserve my --

5 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Oh, sure, absolutely.

6 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay, thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN BLACK: You didn't -- fine.

8 MR. MARK HOLLOWAY: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: And for the record, I'll
10 ask the same question. Is there a motion to
11 remove Chairman Black from the Planning
12 Commission for this hearing?

13 Hearing none, Chairman Black will remain
14 seated. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I would ask each one of
16 these members, starting with Grant Clark if he
17 has any additional things that he had not
18 disclosed since yesterday.

19 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I have no additional
20 contacts since last night.

21 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Anyone in the audience wish
22 to object to Grant Clark sitting on the board?

23 Seeing no one, Scott Pernaa.

24 COMMISSIONER PERNA: I also have had no
25 contact since last night.

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Anyone in the audience
2 wishing to object to Scott Perna sitting on the
3 board?

4 Mark McClain.

5 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Like Commissioner
6 Bowen, I have had procedural discussion with
7 Deputy Prosecutor Jim Hurson. Other than that,
8 no other disclosure.

9 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Anyone in the audience
10 wishing to have Mark McClain removed from the
11 board?

12 Doug Harris?

13 COMMISSIONER HARRIS: None.

14 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Anyone wishing to have
15 Doug -- objecting to Doug Harris sitting on the
16 board?

17 Don Williamson?

18 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: Last night I asked
19 the man who stood up and said he was a mechanical
20 engineer if there was a formula that could
21 determine how much the sound was attenuated from
22 the point of origination, which is the turbine,
23 to the house; and he said there was none
24 available to him.

25 I work in the physics department at CWU, and

1 I talked with one of our professors, and he says
2 not only is there a formula, he has a research
3 project going on with some of his students, and
4 they're working in the area of Tri-Cities.
5 There's a wind farm down there; Nine Valleys I
6 think is the name of that project.

7 And he says they are very interested in
8 that. Their results are inconclusive right now
9 because they do not have enough data to actually
10 set it up. There is a program that does that.

11 And I asked him if he would, would he let me
12 know as soon as he gets some conclusive
13 information, and he said he would. They just
14 started waiting -- there's not much wind in the
15 wintertime -- until they get some relatively high
16 winds. They don't know what the result of high
17 wind on the noise is, and so he will not know
18 until they get some high winds, and it'll
19 probably be sometime this spring.

20 But I wanted to know because I wanted to be
21 able to intelligently diagnose what they -- the
22 experts present at what the noise factor will be.
23 Unfortunately he was not able to give me that
24 information, but I'm sure he will.

25 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you. Is there anyone

1 in the audience that wishes to object to Don
2 Williamson sitting on the commission?

3 Seeing no one, we will go to -- I believe
4 Mr. Piercy has some information or some staff
5 information?

6 MR. PIERCY: Mr. Chairman, I do. Thank you.
7 For the record, Darryl Piercy, director of
8 Community Development Services.

9 I wanted everyone to be aware of some
10 actions that were taken by County staff this
11 evening. First off, we were able to duplicate
12 and provide to all members of the Planning
13 Commission as well as the Board of County
14 Commissioners the items that were submitted into
15 the record last evening. There were a total of
16 16 written items that were submitted into the
17 record. Those have been distributed to all of
18 the Planning Commission members and the Board of
19 County Commissioners.

20 In addition, as part of the testimony that
21 was received last night, we have requested a copy
22 of the PowerPoint presentation that was provided
23 by the applicant. We have not yet received that,
24 but as soon as we do, we will have that in a hard
25 copy form, place that also into the record, and

1 give a copy to each of the Planning Commission
2 members as well as the Board of County
3 Commissioners.

4 And there is a letter from the Washington
5 Department of Fish & Wildlife that was identified
6 in testimony last night. We yet do not have a
7 copy of that letter. Again, we have requested
8 that letter and will be submitting that to the
9 members as well.

10 Excuse me, those are in your record and they
11 have been distributed. So they have been
12 provided -- we have been provided a copy of that.

13 You should also be aware that following last
14 night's meeting, the department has received a
15 number of inquiries in regards to two of the
16 submittal items that were part of the application
17 from the applicant. Those were the Proposed
18 Findings of Facts and Conclusions for the
19 project. They are identified as Book 1 and
20 Book 2, dated December 30th of 2005.

21 We have limited numbers of copies of that
22 available. We have requested additional copies
23 from the applicant as well as requesting the
24 document in electronic format. We anticipate
25 receipt of that at a very short period of time

1 and will begin distributing that once we have
2 those copies available.

3 So anyone wishing to receive a copy of that,
4 please contact our office, Department of
5 Community Development Services, and as soon as
6 those copies are available we'll be happy to
7 distribute those as well. And again, we have to
8 have them in both formats, but the easiest for
9 distribution will be in the electronic format.

10 In addition, for those of you in attendance
11 this evening that may have seen discussions
12 between myself as the director of the department
13 and Mr. Hurson, along with other members of the
14 Planning Commission and Board of County
15 Commissioners, the primary focus of our
16 conversation this evening prior to the meeting
17 was a discussion in regards to the scheduling
18 following tonight's activities.

19 We did discuss the possibility of
20 continuation of this hearing should it not
21 conclude this evening. We also discussed the
22 possibility of the next available date, should
23 the hearing conclude, as to when the Planning
24 Commission may want to reconvene to begin their
25 deliberations.

1 The discussions centered around the concept
2 of giving the Planning Commission adequate time
3 to review the record, to have an opportunity to
4 read and review all of the information that has
5 been submitted, prior to reconvening and starting
6 on their deliberations.

7 We have indicated to all members of the
8 Planning Commission, as well as the Board of
9 County Commissioners that this facility is
10 available tomorrow night, and we would also look
11 forward to some time next week, with Monday being
12 a holiday, perhaps Tuesday or Wednesday for a
13 possible reconvening of the Planning Commission.

14 But again, that's a housekeeping item that
15 will be discussed at a later time. But just to
16 know that that discussion has in fact taken
17 place.

18 I'd be happy to respond to any questions or
19 comments that either the Planning Commission or
20 the Board of County Commissioners might have of
21 staff this evening prior to beginning.

22 CHAIRMAN BLACK: No.

23 MR. PIERCY: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Piercy.

25 At this time we have approximately 90 names

1 yet to testify. We don't think we'll get through
2 this, this evening. Kind of the schedule that we
3 would like to work towards is about to five to
4 8:00 we'll have a break, about five to 9:00 we'll
5 have a break, and we'll probably go to ten
6 o'clock, 10:15 and at that time see how many are
7 left to do. Then we hope to -- if we're still --
8 additional testimony, we will continue until
9 tomorrow evening at 6:30.

10 And so with that, the staff report has been
11 done, the applicant's report has been given;
12 we're into the public testimony. So Mandy?

13 MS. WEED: Cheryl Chance?

14 MS. CHERYL CHANCE: Good evening. My name
15 is Cheryl Chance. I reside at 1411 Howard Road
16 here in Ellensburg, Washington.

17 Good evening. I'd like to take this
18 opportunity to thank the Board of Commissioners
19 to allow me to testify at this time instead of
20 later. Also I'd like to thank the Planning
21 Commission for this opportunity to testify, and
22 the staff.

23 Ladies and gentlemen, I stand opposed to the
24 Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project. I'd like
25 to -- those of you who know me know that I like

1 numbers, and I also like the numbers to balance.
2 This particular project has been advertised as
3 64 turbines, but I believe the application says
4 up to 80. Forgive me, Mr. Johnson, but in
5 tonight's paper it says 64 turbines.

6 The engineering studies done for the DEIS I
7 believe are based on 64 turbines. Based on
8 64 turbines. I believe which means we don't have
9 an engineering analysis for the additional
10 proposed 16 turbines. Therefore, does the DEIS
11 represent ultimately what is being proposed?

12 This is important because the maps -- and
13 I'm referring to the handouts that I picked up
14 last night -- the maps, Exhibit 2, Book 1 of the
15 applicant's handout of last night, shows
16 64 turbines. On Page 1.1 of the same handout,
17 second paragraph, eighth line down, says 80
18 turbines. In the staff's proposed project,
19 Page 7 of 26, wind turbine generators, a maximum
20 of 80 wind turbines.

21 Okay, that may or may not be accurate. So
22 my question is, will there be 64 turbines,
23 80 turbines, or somewhere in between?

24 The impact which is supposed to be addressed
25 in the DEIS for such things as shadow flicker,

1 et cetera, is important. How are the citizens to
2 know the true impacts? This same concern of the
3 citizens would also apply to the length and
4 location of the strings of the turbines. So what
5 are the citizens supposed to understand? What is
6 the real proposal which is based on, in part, on
7 the number of turbines?

8 This is, in my opinion, intrinsic to the
9 accuracy of the application. We either have a
10 flawed application, an incomplete application, or
11 both. I'm confused. I'd like to see the numbers
12 balance. Can anybody help me?

13 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would
14 suggest we go ahead, take the testimony, and
15 we'll come back to this question later --

16 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay.

17 MS. CHERYL CHANCE: Okay, that's my concern,
18 because it has been advertised in the Daily
19 Record as 64 turbines. In tonight's paper, which
20 I forgot to bring, it says 64 turbines. And so
21 this is my concern. I believe the DEIS only
22 addresses 16.

23 So when you start adding -- I mean 64. When
24 you start adding 16 more turbines, you
25 significantly change the scope of this project.

1 Again, thank you for the opportunity to
2 testify. Does anyone before me have any
3 questions? Because I still have that question.

4 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I think that you'll find
5 that the -- I think that you'll find that the
6 applicant is taking some notes and will probably
7 be able to answer those types of questions.
8 We're not able to do that at this time.

9 MS. CHERYL CHANCE: Okay. I was just --
10 because --

11 CHAIRMAN BLACK: But I think that's part of
12 the testimony, is to bring out these things so
13 that they do have a chance of rebuttal on those
14 things.

15 MS. CHERYL CHANCE: Okay. And that's my
16 concern, is if people are relying on the maps,
17 which shows 64, and people are relying on our
18 community newspaper, when we have 80 there's a
19 discrepancy. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you very much.

21 MS. WEED: Michael Ptaszynski?

22 Preston Shugart?

23 Ann Gabrielson?

24 Gordon Gabrielson?

25 Tracy Frame?

1 Skip Littlefield?

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you speak up?

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: They may be here, but
4 nobody can hear you.

5 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Skip Littlefield?

6 Joe Brown? Joe Brown?

7 Jeff Slothower?

8 MR. JEFF SLOTHOWER: Here.

9 Good evening. My name is Jeff Slothower,
10 and I reside at 2581 Hunter Road in Ellensburg.
11 I'm speaking tonight on behalf of myself; my
12 wife, Susan Harrel; and Steve Lathrop, who
13 happens to be out of state for the week.

14 First I would like to make a couple of
15 observations on last night. First, it would have
16 been nice to have the tabs that they referenced
17 available to the public. I don't know when the
18 County received them, but they certainly weren't
19 available to the public, as far as I can tell in
20 some brief checking I did last night and also in
21 some checking I did today.

22 That aside, I want to make a couple of
23 observations on what you heard last night.

24 First, with respect to the Comprehensive Plan, I
25 have lived here since 1984. I participated in

1 the mid 1990s as a citizen in the adoption of the
2 current Comprehensive Plan. I work with that
3 document on a daily basis in my profession right
4 now.

5 That plan is a guide; it's not a
6 hard-and-fast rule book. It's designed under the
7 Growth Management Act to guide development in the
8 next 20 years, subject to regular amendments.

9 For every argument that a particular project
10 fits or is consistent with or implements the
11 Comprehensive Plan, you can go through the
12 Comprehensive Plan and you can pick out areas
13 where it doesn't fit with the Comprehensive Plan,
14 doesn't implement the Comprehensive Plan, and
15 arguably may be inconsistent.

16 I raise that because I disagree with the
17 assertion that this project and projects like
18 this automatically protect resource lands. I
19 don't believe they do. I believe that that is an
20 argument that ultimately will prove wrong.

21 I believe that this type of a project, with
22 its aesthetic impacts and its impact on our view
23 shed and its impact on -- basically a
24 disincentive to locate in areas of the county
25 where arguably growth should occur, creates an

1 incentive for the growth that will surely come
2 and is coming to this valley to locate on the
3 valley floor or in other parts of the valley
4 where arguably we would -- where there are
5 resource lands that are worthy of protecting and
6 should be protected.

7 So I think that to use the Comprehensive
8 Plan and then say that we're protecting resource
9 lands by adopting this project is not a valid
10 argument.

11 Secondly, I really enjoyed listening to Tom
12 Priestly, the expert who performed the aesthetic
13 analysis, and I think it's very important to
14 listen to what he said.

15 I took three things away from his testimony
16 last night. A, the first proposed project had
17 high aesthetic impacts in a number of places.
18 The reduced project, despite removing a number of
19 towers, a significant number of towers, still has
20 high aesthetic impact in places. And those
21 aesthetic impacts are not impacts that can be
22 mitigated.

23 And at this point I want to talk just a
24 little bit about impacts. Look at Horizon's
25 proposed findings. Much like EnXco, Horizon

1 proposes to buy easements from neighboring
2 landowners or non-participating landowners, as
3 they refer to them, when towers are located near
4 neighboring -- or non-participating properties.

5 I think that clearly demonstrates and drives
6 home the point that this type of an industrial
7 development has negative impacts that are -- that
8 are -- that you cannot mitigate on neighbors, the
9 neighborhood, and the surrounding character of
10 the neighborhood. Maybe these neighbors that
11 sell the easements will have the resources to
12 purchase the curtains and blinds that EnXco
13 freely admitted they needed.

14 Third, I wanted to talk about the property
15 value analysis. And one thing that I've always
16 enjoyed in being a lawyer and what I like about
17 experts is once you get them on the payroll, they
18 pretty much will say anything you want.

19 You need to pay particular attention to what
20 Mr. DeLacey said, because what he said is scary.
21 In order to know if there will be an impact on
22 property values, you need to build the towers,
23 you need comparable sales data, and then you'll
24 do an appraisal. In other words, he was correct:
25 Never buy land where the appraisers are buying,

1 because they're the last to know. We will not
2 know if there's a negative impact on property
3 values until it exists. That's the message I
4 took away from his testimony.

5 I think you'll hear other people provide
6 contrary evidence that there's already evidence
7 of a negative affect on property values of a
8 chilling in the market in that area where this
9 project is proposed.

10 But -- and then Mr. DeLacey suggests that we
11 rely on anecdotal evidence to -- which now
12 suggests that, well, there will be no impact.
13 Again, not knowing whether there really will be
14 an impact to the property values in the area
15 until we build these. So that -- that kind of
16 expert testimony is scary at best, and should
17 really open your eyes.

18 Fourth, and this is -- you know, when I
19 first met Chris Taylor, he came to my office to
20 talk to me and to -- and to a couple of the other
21 lawyers in our office to see how we felt about
22 the project. He was trying to generate support.

23 And I'll admit that was a much different
24 project. And I had just built a house and the
25 house had -- arguably has some of these towers in

1 the view -- in its view. And so I said, Well,
2 Chris, I can't really figure out how this is
3 going to impact me, so why don't you come out to
4 my house, come out on my patio, take a picture,
5 and do a simulation.

6 And he did it, and I was very appreciative
7 of that. He e-mailed it to me with a short
8 e-mail saying, See, I don't think that there's
9 any impacts. And when I looked at it, I had a
10 different perspective.

11 So I -- my next real encounter with wind
12 farms is I went on a wine tour in Walla Walla
13 with some friends, and there were six of us: my
14 wife and I, both lawyers; a developer; and a
15 doctor from Seattle. And we drove to Walla
16 Walla, and as we started to see these turbines,
17 you know, they had -- that was my next encounter
18 with them, and it -- and I looked at them and I
19 thought, you know, these don't fit; they're out
20 of place with the environment, they are out of
21 place with the landscape; they're disruptive.

22 And at that point I did some additional
23 looking at wind towers, and one thing that I have
24 never been able to find is the economics on these
25 things. We've heard people -- I've been through

1 these hearings. You know, I counted it up today;
2 I think this is probably I'm into maybe 20-some
3 hours' worth of wind power hearings over the last
4 four years.

5 And I've heard a lot of people talking about
6 tax incentives: They're only doing this for the
7 tax incentives. And I've other people say, Oh,
8 no, this is the wave of the future; it's a
9 profitable venture. But not in the mountain of
10 paperwork have I seen the pro forma, the dollar,
11 the bottom line. And that causes me some
12 concern.

13 And I'm particularly concerned here because
14 I don't see who's operating this project in ten
15 years. I don't see where the power's going. I
16 don't see where the revenue's going.

17 Mr. Bowen, you're the chairman right now.
18 You don't know who the chairman's going to be in
19 ten years. Are you going to saddle him or her
20 with an unknown entity to deal with on such an
21 important scale when some -- a project like this
22 when something goes wrong? Who are we dealing
23 with?

24 We know that Horizon is in the business of
25 developing wind power and we all know that there

1 are appropriate places to locate wind power. And
2 I view it still as an experiment. I may be
3 wrong, but I view it as an experience -- as an
4 experiment. But I just don't see the economics
5 there.

6 And then I hear everybody talking about the
7 tax incentives and the subsidies that are out
8 there. And if the true economics are that this
9 is a subsidized industry -- and I believe that
10 that's the true economics, that it is a
11 subsidized industry -- then the argument that
12 hey, you know, this project is going to put
13 \$1.6 million into Kittitas County -- and by the
14 way, when they gave us that figure they didn't
15 tell us what the time line was on that.

16 That's a circular argument that's invalid,
17 in my book, because I'm the taxpayer that just
18 put the money in my pocket. I took money out of
19 one pocket and put it in the other. I don't
20 think that argument works, and that causes me
21 some concern.

22 Now, comments about last night aside, the
23 reason that you need to deny this and the reason
24 I think you have to deny it is that this is about
25 the location of a wind power project. It's not

1 about whether wind power is good, bad, great for
2 the environment, bad for the environment. It's
3 about location.

4 And Horizon, Puget Sound Energy, and EnXco
5 have made you gentlemen experts on wind power
6 project locations. In fact, you may be the most
7 knowledgeable individuals on the location of wind
8 power projects in the state of Washington. I'm
9 confident you have more knowledge, more expertise
10 based upon practical experience than anyone
11 sitting on the EFSEC panel.

12 So you people make the decision. And you
13 need to rely on your experiences over the last
14 four years in siting, in permitting these
15 projects. You've got two; you denied one and you
16 approved one.

17 And I'm going to ask you tonight in denying
18 this project to do one simple thing: Take the
19 findings from Wild Horse, take your factual
20 findings that you prepared and you put together
21 to support the Wild Horse finding, the Wild Horse
22 project. Pull it out, take a look at the
23 findings. Not one of those findings is present
24 here. Not one.

25 There is no single landowner with huge

1 buffers between adjoining landowners; and there
2 are -- instead there are multiple landowners with
3 hundreds of neighbors. There are, by my count,
4 rough count, it looks like over a hundred houses
5 in and around the project, not the one that there
6 was located a mile away from Wild Horse.

7 This has got an extremely high aesthetic
8 impact. Everyone who drives the Highway 97
9 scenic corridor, everyone who drives
10 Interstate 90 and looks at the Stuarts, the
11 signature trademark of Kittitas Valley, is going
12 to see these. This stands out. You didn't have
13 that in Wild Horse.

14 Here you've got recognized, admitted impacts
15 on neighbors that cannot be mitigated. So
16 instead they're insured around. Think about your
17 last insurance claim.

18 None of the factors that you relied on in
19 Wild Horse are present, not one.

20 Now, take the EnXco findings, the ones you
21 relied upon to deny that project, the ones that
22 were upheld in court, and pull them out. All the
23 factors you relied on to deny EnXco are present
24 here in this project: the site, the topography,
25 the number of houses, the terrain; it's

1 identical. The existing land uses, identical.
2 The -- there is a comparable number of
3 residences. There's a comparable number of tax
4 parcels.

5 There are impacts just like in Wild -- or in
6 EnXco that you absolutely cannot admit --
7 mitigate. And they admit it.

8 The factors in EnXco that led you to
9 conclude that the project was detrimental or
10 injurious to the public health, peace, and safety
11 or the character of the surrounding
12 neighborhood -- or the character of the
13 surrounding neighborhood. You see that term a
14 lot. I work with it a lot in my -- my business
15 in front of you gentlemen. The character of the
16 surrounding neighborhood. In EnXco that's what
17 you looked at. You looked at the character of
18 the surrounding neighborhood, exact same project,
19 exact same impact, within two miles of this
20 project, and you concluded that that project was
21 injurious to the character of the neighborhood.

22 It's present here. You do -- you approve
23 this and you've injured the character of this
24 neighborhood, you've approved a project that is
25 detrimental and injurious to the public health,

1 peace, and safety of the community. You clearly
2 have.

3 All of the factors that led you to conclude
4 that the EnXco project would be unreasonably
5 detrimental to the economic welfare of the county
6 and would create excessive costs are also
7 present.

8 And I remember hours of discussion in EnXco
9 about this development agreement and, you know,
10 what the bonding requirements were going to be
11 and et cetera and et cetera. We're not even
12 there, and you know why? We don't know who's
13 operating this. We don't know. You don't know.
14 So there's even greater uncertainty.

15 And then I would submit a detrimental impact
16 on the economic welfare of the county and the
17 clear possibility that you would create excessive
18 cost. And when I think about excessive cost, and
19 I always think of one of the first visions I have
20 the Kittitas Valley, and this goes back, you
21 know, 19 -- late 1970s, between Seattle and
22 Pullman.

23 And you always get to the crest of the hill
24 there, what I now know as Horlick Road, and
25 there's this goofy little metal structure that,

1 you know, once I moved here I learned was an
2 experimental wind power project from sometime in
3 the '60s or '70s. And it's there, it's still
4 there. And you wonder why is it still there?

5 Well, it was an experiment that didn't work.
6 And A, the guy who put it there or the business
7 who put it there didn't have the money to remove
8 it; or B -- and this is what obviously
9 occurred -- it was put there probably through
10 some type of process that didn't deal with the
11 long-term impact in case it didn't work or had to
12 be removed. You don't have any of that here.

13 So I think you have a real danger that
14 you're going to -- that this is going to be
15 unreasonably detrimental to the economic welfare
16 of the county and create excessive cost.

17 Now, the reasons -- again, go back to the
18 reasons that you relied on in EnXco to deny the
19 application. They're all present here; it is no
20 different. It may be wrapped in a different
21 package, admittedly tied up in a nicer bow. But
22 it's the same. And just like EnXco, it should be
23 denied.

24 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Any questions? Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: I have a question.

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Oh --

2 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: I have a question.
3 Mark McClain.

4 You indicated that you're involved in a lot
5 of development in this area -- or that you do
6 development. Can you tell me about the
7 development that's occurring in this area that
8 you're aware of?

9 MR. JEFF SLOTHOWER: Well, I think the
10 development you're referring to is a rezone that
11 I brought through the Planning Commission a
12 number of -- well, three or four months ago.
13 That's a non-project action. Ms. Anderson was
14 correct last night. That rezone does not
15 automatically create "X" number of houses.

16 I will say, however, there are a number of
17 those types of non-project actions, some of which
18 are ultimately going to need -- going to lead to
19 additional houses in the area and thus additional
20 conflicts with this type of an industrial
21 development.

22 I'd also -- on the subject of development, I
23 think if you take a look at the map -- and last
24 night Horizon had a very good map against the
25 back wall. I don't see it there tonight. And I

1 know it's recreated in some of the materials that
2 I've seen.

3 But look at the expanded one, because what
4 it shows is all of the subdivision that has
5 occurred in this area over the last few years.
6 And you know, one thing that would be really nice
7 to look at -- and I don't know, it can't be
8 replicated, as far as I can tell, at least not
9 with the resources I'm dealing with -- would be
10 to look at the tax parcels five years ago and
11 look at them now.

12 The area is constantly being divided, you
13 know. 80 to 90 percent of those tax parcels were
14 created under the prior subdivision code, which
15 allowed exempt segregations in the land without a
16 review process.

17 But what it -- what it does tell you and
18 what it -- and the message you should take away
19 is that this is the area -- one of the areas of
20 the valley where there is a lot of residential
21 and recreational development right now and the
22 prospect of additional recreational development
23 occurring here is very good with the rezones, the
24 non-project action rezones and the subdivision of
25 the property. And candidly, if you put it up

1 there, you won't have to worry about it on the
2 valley floor creating, you know, the rural sprawl
3 that we're all so afraid of, so.

4 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Any other questions? Thank
5 you.

6 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Mr. Chairman, did you
7 want to go to your break or to the next speaker?

8 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Is it time?

9 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: It's six minutes to
10 8:00.

11 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Yeah, let's go for a
12 ten-minute break.

13 (A break was taken.)

14 CHAIRMAN BLACK: We're ready to go with the
15 next testimony.

16 MS. BARRET: Larry Putnam?

17 MR. LARRY PUTNAM: My name is Larry Putnam.
18 I live at 3601 Emerck Road. That's up on Lookout
19 Mountain.

20 I am a contractor, developer, and I spend a
21 lot of time in land investment, buying and
22 selling. I actually purchased and sold six
23 parcels in that area out there. I did very well
24 on them, but that was before there was any
25 mention of wind farms.

1 In regards to -- in regards to Exhibit 10 --
2 which I'm sure you've all read; that's the report
3 on the land value impacts -- this was done by
4 apparently a very qualified person. A paid
5 consultant by Sagebrush. As we all know that you
6 can take two highly skilled, paid consultants and
7 get two totally different pictures even though
8 they may be all telling the truth. You see that
9 in the courtroom all the time. That's what you
10 have here.

11 From all the years of experience that I have
12 here in this valley, my opinion is it's wrong.
13 Your property values will be -- will be
14 diminished. And I hope that the Planning
15 Commission listens to other real estate people
16 that are local, other land developers, other
17 investors. And you'll get a totally different
18 picture.

19 I only have one other thing. Does anyone
20 know what is in place or what provisions are in
21 place to prevent Horizon or anyone else from
22 adding additional towers at a later date? There
23 is none? What would be the process if they
24 wanted to?

25 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Through the development

1 agreement? Would be through the development
2 agreement.

3 MR. HURSON: Mr. Chairman, Jim Hurson. Just
4 as far as your process -- and I've had other
5 people in the audience ask me this during the
6 break -- what I have suggested to people if they
7 have questions, what the questions -- maybe the
8 way is, is they aren't supposed to be asking the
9 applicant questions. They can ask the Planning
10 Commission: These are questions I have. And
11 then ask the Planning Commission maybe to ask
12 these questions of the applicant or staff. And
13 so that can kind of help keep it focused.

14 Because the way the public process is set
15 up, it is not for a question-and-answer session
16 between the Board and the public; it's for the
17 public to provide information, provide questions,
18 provide spots or issues for the Planning
19 Commission, and for the Planning Commission to
20 take that and do with it as they may.

21 So that -- I would suggest that you not try
22 to be in a dialogue, but if this gentlemen has
23 questions, those can be noted; he can maybe then
24 ask the Planning Commission to ask the applicant
25 to answer those sorts of questions, and then when

1 they have a chance to rebut, they can do that.

2 MR. LARRY PUTNAM: Then what I will comment
3 on that is if in fact Horizon or someone else can
4 come back a couple years from now and make
5 application to put those "X"s back in, if they
6 can do that, it's going to be hard to turn them
7 down once you've already turned that into a
8 industrial park. When I look at those "X"s, I
9 see Phase 2.

10 Any questions?

11 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: You said you've
12 developed something in this area? You've sold
13 some plots. Can you elaborate on that?

14 MR. LARRY PUTNAM: Up on top of Lookout
15 Mountain.

16 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: I guess I mean a
17 number and character. You said you sold some --

18 MR. LARRY PUTNAM: They were parcels that
19 varied from 8 acres to 20 acres.

20 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: And since?

21 MR. LARRY PUTNAM: Well, I've built a lot of
22 things around -- I've built the Centennial
23 Center, developed that. Storage units. And I've
24 bought a lot of different pieces of land in the
25 general area and sold them.

1 Thank you very much.

2 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

3 MS. BARRET: Mike Robertson?

4 MR. MIKE ROBERTSON: My name is Mike
5 Robertson. I live at 4101 Bettas Road, Cle Elum.
6 I'm representing myself and my wife Elizabeth.

7 I believe it should be evident at this
8 point -- I believe it should be evident at this
9 point that the project is in the wrong place and
10 inconsistent with land-use trends for the area.

11 The applicant has reduced the number of
12 turbines from their original project application,
13 but using their own EIS addendum documentation
14 they still have not mitigated impacts the project
15 would create.

16 Although this hearing is to determine
17 whether this project is consistent with current
18 land uses, the applicant has decided to inundate
19 you folks with updated EIS information. And I'd
20 like to respond to just two of these impacts.

21 Shadow flicker is still affecting
22 non-participating neighbors. By their own
23 analysis, our residents will be affected 149 days
24 a year, and there are other neighbors in the area
25 that will be affected even more. My closest

1 neighbor will be affected 240 days a year.

2 The applicant's mitigation is to have us
3 install blinds or plant trees. This is
4 unacceptable. No other land use I am aware of
5 requires the affected parties to mitigate impacts
6 caused by a proposed land use.

7 There is only one acceptable mitigation for
8 shadow flicker, and that is sufficient setback
9 distance. This setback distance should be
10 measured from non-participating landowner
11 boundary lines, not just existing residences.
12 Shadow flicker limits the land uses for
13 non-participating property owners. As an
14 example, it is widely accepted that shadow
15 flicker affects horses as well as people. And
16 people in the area have horses.

17 Another impact that the applicant fails to
18 even acknowledge is low frequency noise that
19 these large machines produce. The applicant has
20 been -- even suggested that these turbines are as
21 quiet as a refrigerator. I don't know where they
22 buy their refrigerators, but any of us that had
23 one that produced a low thumping sound, I'm sure
24 it would be removed from our homes.

25 And that is the main point about low

1 frequency sound impacts. There is no mitigation
2 for this impact other than locating the turbines
3 at great distance from people. You have to act
4 conservatively on siting these machines because
5 after installation, the only option to fix the
6 problem would be to remove them.

7 Finally, the wind industry would have us
8 believe that wind farms are just an extension of
9 agricultural land use. This is nothing but spin.
10 A commercial wind farm is an industrial
11 power-generation facility and it is incompatible
12 with rural residential land use, which is
13 prevalent in the proposed location.

14 I urge you to deny this project application
15 as inconsistent with current land uses for the
16 area. Thanks.

17 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you. Questions?
18 Thank you.

19 MS. BARRET: Elizabeth Robertson?

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: She's not here tonight.

21 MS. BARRET: William Erickson?

22 MR. WILLIAM ERICKSON: I'm William Erickson,
23 address 6980 Wilson Creek Road. I also have
24 property up in Naneum.

25 I'm against these wind farms in the valley.

1 To create large wind industrial generating
2 complexes within the Kittitas Valley is wrong.
3 These complexes are not compatible with the
4 people living in the rural residences.

5 I'm concerned because I live in the north
6 end of the valley, and I may be a distance from
7 the proposed project along Highway 97, I am
8 downwind of it and downwind of the second
9 proposed project, being EnXco. I think they're
10 still in some litigation on it.

11 The way the agreements are written, the
12 complexes are -- areas are flexible and they
13 could be located in my back yard. We've lived
14 there for nearly 37 years and don't appreciate
15 things like this coming into the valley that
16 cause people problems.

17 When one gets its foot in the door, you can
18 expect there's going to be a lot more of them
19 that are going to want to be there too.

20 I'm concerned about the health, safety, and
21 welfare of the county residents. Health means
22 both physical and mental. It doesn't take much
23 stress to send someone over the edge. And I'm
24 sure that some people perhaps living with that,
25 the flicker and all, not only would be -- it

1 would be a physical but it would be a mental
2 thing.

3 The noise has been addressed. It's
4 something like a car pulling up next to you at a
5 stop sign or a stop light and you hear that boom,
6 boom, boom. I normally turn to my wife and say
7 there's something wrong with that car. But it's
8 similar to that. It's kind of that type of a
9 noise that's annoying if you have to live with
10 that. It's just not the best thing.

11 The flicker, the sunlight is totally
12 unacceptable. We know how large corporations
13 work with mitigation. I mean, the pipeline going
14 up to the upper county was -- large corporations
15 normally try and run over the landowners. I
16 mean, that's -- that's obvious from our -- from
17 that experience. And so it's not very acceptable
18 with the small people working with the large
19 corporations. They don't work too well with you.

20 The strobe lights on the -- on the wind --
21 on the turbines, I have a farm magazine that I
22 get, and I've ordered a couple of strobe lights
23 from them for the express purpose of to get rid
24 of ground hogs and that type of thing.

25 Strobe lights are detrimental to the -- to

1 your wildlife. You get your deer, your elk, and
2 so forth and they see that constant flashing,
3 they clear out. You're not going to have that
4 type of wildlife in the area where those are at.

5 There's dust. I read a letter to the
6 editor -- a letter to the editor of somebody who
7 was viewing them down in Walla Walla and they --
8 and they started up. There was dust from the
9 turbulence. And it's the same thing that you
10 would have here. You would have that -- you'd
11 have dust in the air. More than what's needed
12 now.

13 Fire. I know that they've made many
14 improvements to the wind farm -- to the turbines.
15 However, anything that's mechanical is subject to
16 failure. You get -- you hear trains crashing,
17 airplanes going down. They've got the best that
18 there is, but sometimes there's failures and it's
19 no different with these.

20 I don't know if you've been in a wind-driven
21 fire. It's a scary thing. There was a little
22 one that was up by our place, and you don't want
23 to be in one. And if you have a wind-driven
24 fire, there's -- I know the -- I think it was
25 EnXco that had something like 80 gallons of -- of

1 oil up in the -- up in the base; and I don't
2 know, with the larger ones it may be more.

3 You have something happen with that, it
4 spreads over a large area, you're not going to
5 contain it. How many homes are there downwind of
6 it? There's hundreds of homes in that -- in the
7 north end of the valley. And there's people. If
8 we don't have to have it, let's not.

9 The liability, also there's a possibility of
10 oil getting into your springs. You have a tower
11 go down, whatever, you have in the surface and
12 under the surface for the wells --

13 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Could you move a little
14 closer to the mic? We're having a problem
15 hearing you in the back, please.

16 MR. WILLIAM ERICKSON: Okay. Liability
17 insurance, it's a limited liability corporation,
18 and before that -- this on many of the
19 applications I've never seen insurance addressed
20 of needing to carry a certain amount. With that
21 many homes downwind, are they willing to -- would
22 they be willing to put, you know, 200 million or
23 300 million with the size of -- with the cost of
24 houses nowadays? There's -- you'd be surprised
25 at the amount of value of what's up there

1 downwind.

2 The feed lines, the grids, the pictures that
3 they show us doesn't -- don't show anything. In
4 the previous agreements or proposed agreements
5 that were from the other ones, if it's more than
6 four feet -- or if it wasn't -- if they couldn't
7 go down four feet if there was rock, they went
8 up. And so you're not seeing everything. You're
9 maybe seeing these turbines.

10 But look at the pictures. There's nothing
11 against the blue sky, there's nothing against the
12 Stuart range. It's really showing you what it's
13 really like. I don't think we can -- we can
14 imagine to know what it's like, even. But I
15 think that it's -- it's not showing it what it
16 is.

17 Property values. The expert, quote/unquote,
18 that we heard from was looking at property values
19 after the intention was announced that there
20 would be a wind farm in the area. What would it
21 have been if there was no announcement? I don't
22 think that we can tell, but I think it would be
23 much higher. It would have an automatic
24 dampening affect on what somebody was -- if they
25 were wanting to purchase.

1 The person that -- yesterday that had over
2 800 acres that sold some said there's only two or
3 three cabins or three or four cabins or whatever
4 on the land. Nobody has taken into consideration
5 how many RV spots there are. Are there snowbirds
6 that -- up there? And they're in Arizona or
7 someplace else now and they come up and park
8 their vehicle, live in it. How many tent sites
9 are there?

10 Those type of people aren't going to want
11 these -- this noise, the -- I mean, they want it
12 where it's quiet. This is what they -- I'm sure
13 that they intended it for.

14 I know when we -- we live in the country and
15 we like it quiet. We expect cows bawling and
16 farm equipment going, but that's only temporary,
17 and you don't hear it all the time; you don't
18 have a constant thump, thump, thump or whatever
19 in the background. We like it quiet.

20 Wind generation is not consistent. So
21 there's a -- you really question whether the
22 capital expenditure for these is worth the
23 output. You look at -- also they say, well, this
24 will produce so-much. What does it produce where
25 it's used? You lose a lot in the transmission

1 lines. The transmission lines, it's one of
2 their -- the objects of trying to place it here,
3 but if it's used in Seattle or wherever, you've
4 got a lot of loss.

5 And you also have to have a back-up thing
6 for that -- when it's not running you have to
7 have a back-up, so you have to have a different
8 type of generation.

9 It would be better for -- for the renewable
10 energy to be looking at the tide -- you have the
11 constant tide falling and to harness that, and
12 then because the bigger cities are along the
13 ocean, you wouldn't have the transmission loss of
14 electricity. It seems to be much better use of
15 the money, of the government money. At least to
16 get more research in it and to produce that.

17 About ten years ago a couple farm boys back
18 in the midwest were producing hydrogen from their
19 own farm pond and bringing it in their pickups.
20 It isn't rocket science technology that those
21 types of things could be dealt with or could be
22 used for that.

23 The wind projects, the actual building of
24 them are exempt from sales tax, so the county
25 isn't going to gain anything from that. I don't

1 know if you're aware of that or not, but
2 that's -- there's no -- there's an exemption
3 there. As many other things with taxes and the
4 exemptions.

5 You have to look at the experts that give
6 you all these opinions. Who's paying for them?
7 And if they didn't give the right opinion, you
8 don't think they're going to be paid. Or, I
9 mean, that's my own personal thought of it. I
10 doubt if any of them are living within the sound
11 or sight of a wind farm. They're expecting us
12 to -- to have to live with it, but they're not
13 willing to themselves.

14 I'd say keep it out of the -- keep it out of
15 the valley. The valley is residential. They
16 compare it with a lot of the other wind farms.
17 There's not residential there; there's wheat
18 fields. Klickitat. There's more on the
19 Columbia -- the side of the Columbia River. If
20 they want a wind farm, why don't they put it down
21 in Hood River where all these windboarders --
22 where that's the capital of the northwest? And
23 they say, Well, that's a gorgeous area. Well,
24 it's no -- it's no less than the Stuart range.

25 I guess that's all for now. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you very much.

2 Questions? Thank you.

3 MS. BARRET: David Gordon?

4 Bettina Rigby?

5 John Rigby?

6 Bob Acheson?

7 Pamela Hillemann?

8 Dennis Rommple?

9 Diane Schwab?

10 Bud Schwab?

11 Colleen Anderson?

12 MS. COLLEEN ANDERSON: Colleen Anderson, 231
13 Peavine Road. I am a realtor at Coldwell Banker,
14 Kittitas Valley Realty, and I've been working
15 there for ten years.

16 I have been involved in the Kittitas County
17 real estate industry for the past ten years. I
18 strongly believe that the wind farms will have an
19 adverse affect on the value of the property close
20 to the proposed wind farms.

21 Based on my research in the Northwest
22 Multiple Listing Service, I have found that
23 active listings near the wind farms have an
24 average days of market of 611 days, while the
25 county-wide average days on market for active

1 listings is 239 days. Also the days on market
2 for sold listings in the wind farm area is 350
3 (sic) days, and the county-wide average days on
4 market for the sold properties is 219 days.

5 In addition, there is also a significant
6 difference on the sale price of properties close
7 to the wind farms versus the average county sale
8 price. Vacant land near the wind farms has
9 average sale price of \$66,038. The county
10 average sale price is \$126,223. The difference
11 in average sale price is \$60,185.

12 My research was based on real estate
13 activity in the last six months for 3- to 20-acre
14 parcels. This is vacant land.

15 Based on this information, it is my
16 professional opinion that real estate values are
17 adversely affected by the wind farms. I strongly
18 urge you to reject the wind farm proposal in
19 order to maintain the quality of life and
20 property values that we presently have in this
21 community.

22 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions?

23 MS. COLLEEN ANDERSON: I do have the
24 printout of all the information --

25 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Would you leave that with

1 her, please. Thank you.

2 MS. BARRET: Phyllis Whitbeck?

3 Woody Whitbeck? Oh, I'm sorry, sorry.

4 MS. PHYLLIS WHITBECK: My name is Phyllis
5 Whitbeck. I am representing myself and my
6 husband. And I wanted to say something about the
7 shadow flicker.

8 Because we have a small wind turbine and
9 it's kind of noisy, to the point like if we
10 wanted to put it up on our lot here in the city
11 of Ellensburg if we had one, they would turn us
12 down; it would be no. I mean, one wouldn't want
13 to live that close to it with their neighbors,
14 you know, with that sort of thing. Nor would the
15 neighbors, well, they wouldn't like to live next
16 to the small turbine.

17 But one day I unknowingly got to working in
18 the flicker of the turbine. The sun was not
19 bright that day, so the flicker wasn't really
20 noticeable. I started to feel terrible, like the
21 flu was happening. And I'm very prone to motion
22 sickness, and the motion of the blade flicker was
23 making me feel sick. I moved and everything was
24 fine.

25 I'd hate to see this happen to somebody, you

1 know, when they have that going through their
2 house. And when the turbine flicker passes over
3 a window, it affects the whole entire room, not
4 just the window. Everyone knows how fast a sun
5 shadow moves. It takes a long time for this
6 flicker shadow to pass over the window. Hours,
7 maybe. You know, like the shadow of a tree
8 moving across the lawn. It takes quite a while.

9 Also with the red flashing lights, imagine a
10 couple of miles of flashing lights. These can be
11 seen from most of our valley. The people that
12 live above those lights will get their biggest
13 impact. My neighbors have their yard lights on
14 at nighttime, and they are a half a mile away
15 from us. These lights light up our house at
16 nighttime, so we do not need any night lights in
17 our house in order to get around.

18 It would be unreal if they were flashing
19 turbine lights. That would be awful. We could
20 close the curtains, but on hot summer nights it
21 would get way too warm and stuffy.

22 I also have a friend that gets tremendous
23 headaches from those kind of lights. If these
24 lights can affect people, I'd hate to meet a bull
25 or a bear affected from these lights while

1 outside enjoying the nighttime.

2 Let us listen to our European neighbors and
3 their warnings on not putting wind turbines in
4 populated areas. They are ahead of us with
5 turbines and know their problems better than our
6 experts here in this room.

7 I want to thank you, and please say no to
8 these wind turbines.

9 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions?

10 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Don?

12 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS: How big is your
13 windmill and how fast does it turn?

14 I'm sorry, I didn't mean to overwhelm you,
15 but --

16 MS. PHYLLIS WHITBECK: Well, I was just
17 trying to think, how can I answer that? It only
18 turns up to so-fast and then it starts to
19 feather. And it ceases to rotate as fast.
20 Otherwise the wind would literally tear it apart.

21 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Speak a little closer to
22 the microphone.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can I add to her question?
24 The blades are seven feet long. I live a half a
25 mile away and I can hear them.

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay, you can do that when
2 you testify, okay?

3 MS. PHYLLIS WHITBECK: Okay, well, I'll
4 testify for him, then. He's my neighbor and he
5 can hear it. Particularly when they feather.
6 But he doesn't hear it when the wind isn't
7 blowing real strong and it's going nicely.

8 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Does that answer your
9 question?

10 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: I think probably
11 the speed of it has as much or more to do with it
12 than anything. If you can't give me an answer,
13 that's okay.

14 MS. PHYLLIS WHITBECK: Well, the only thing
15 I can say is that it's not too loud up to a
16 certain point; and when it tries to feather or
17 put its brakes on, and that's when it makes the
18 noise.

19 Now, I don't know how these newer ones keep
20 from blowing themselves apart, you know, with
21 50-, 60-, 80-mile-an-hour winds. When they start
22 to slow down, how do they slow down or how much
23 noise do they make when they are slowing down?

24 And that seems to be about the noisiest part
25 that I know of with the wind turbine. It seemed

1 that way too with the other small ones I have
2 encountered. They are getting better and better
3 with it, though. I mean, things are improving.

4 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you very much.

5 MS. PHYLLIS WHITBECK: Okay.

6 MS. BARRET: Woody Whitbeck?

7 MS. PHYLLIS WHITBECK: He wasn't going to
8 testify.

9 MS. BARRET: Linda or Bobby Rubio?

10 James Havens?

11 Linda Schantz?

12 MS. LINDA SCHANTZ: Hi. My name is Linda
13 Schantz, and I'm representing my husband and
14 myself, who both reside at 4190 Robbins Road in
15 Ellensburg.

16 Last February I read in the Daily Record an
17 article that was written by a House of
18 Representative member, Mr. Frank Miller. And he
19 sent out a letter regarding wind power, stating
20 that the push for wind power comes only in the
21 light of tax breaks and income for wind power
22 companies.

23 He went on to outline the four tax breaks
24 that wind power companies get, the largest being
25 a federal production tax credit of .018 cent per

1 kilowatt hour produced for the first ten years of
2 operation. He gave an example of a hundred-tower
3 farm rated at a hundred megawatts at 30 percent
4 efficiency would generate an income of
5 \$47 million in ten years.

6 So I'm making this point not because I want
7 to argue whether wind farms should exist in our
8 country but to really say that's why we're here
9 and that's why we've been in this hearing and all
10 the others. It's all about money for the wind
11 farms.

12 And that's why we're here, and the wind farm
13 companies would really kind of be stupid not to
14 try to take advantage of this, and their
15 objective is to get as many in as quickly as
16 possible.

17 Wind farms are not compatible with our
18 county's stated objectives, which is to keep the
19 Kittitas Valley a rural valley with a vibrant
20 city and university in its center. As landowners
21 and tax payers, we have a Comprehensive Plan and
22 zoning laws that protect us.

23 If the Comp Plan and zoning laws supported
24 wind farms, as Mr. Peck suggests, then why was
25 the original wind power project abandoned? Why

1 are we still working on the land-use issues three
2 years later?

3 The reason is that wind farms do not belong
4 where people live and that our zoning laws and
5 Comp Plans do protect the citizens from
6 inappropriate industrial development. For us the
7 fight has always been about location.

8 The size of the proposed wind farm now is
9 about approximately ten miles in length and six
10 miles in width. There are approximately 80 to
11 100 residences that will bear the burden of the
12 noise, the shadows, the strobing, and visual
13 impacts from the placement of that wind farm.
14 Their quality of life would be negatively
15 impacted and some of them severely. And I, I
16 believe that this number is unacceptable and
17 should be unacceptable to you.

18 We hear from the noise experts that graph
19 the dBAs and decimels and -- or decibels, and
20 they state there's no inherent danger to
21 residents. Then why do we hear testimony from
22 residents in Pennsylvania and Ohio and other
23 states that state the noise has affected their
24 quality of life and their ability to sleep? Why
25 has Great Britain commissioned a study on the

1 health affects of wind turbines on nearby
2 residents? The reason, you can't fit human life
3 and human sensitivity into a graph and into
4 numbers.

5 On last night's testimony I questioned why
6 there were no similar situations or comparisons
7 on property values comparing the Kittitas Valley
8 situation with other wind farms. Certainly we
9 really need to expect evidence that supports
10 their claim that our property values will not be
11 affected.

12 Yes, Horizon has reduced the number of
13 turbines, but it was never about whether there
14 were 50 or 100. It's always been about no
15 turbines where people live. Why do we think --
16 or why do they think Whiskey Dick went through so
17 fast? They're already starting to build it.

18 Lastly, regarding the participating
19 landowners, you know, you just can't have it both
20 ways. It was stated last night in testimony that
21 the property was bought to utilize the natural
22 resources. Then in another testimony it was
23 stated how many parcels of land were sold to
24 recreationalists and residential homes. I
25 propose it's too late for the former. The land

1 has been divided and the development has begun.
2 It is far too late.

3 Thank you. Any questions?

4 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

5 MS. BARRET: Mary Morgan?

6 MS. MARY MORGAN: I'm Mary Morgan. I live
7 at 771 -- 771 Watson Road here in Ellensburg.
8 I've lived in Ellensburg almost eight years. I'm
9 a native of the state of Washington. My family
10 homesteaded in the upper county. And I moved
11 back over here several years ago.

12 And I just have one question. They keep
13 talking about the million dollars to a million
14 and a half, somewhere in that range, that we're
15 going to get in tax dollars. My question to you
16 and my real concern to you is, what's it worth to
17 us to give up one of the most extraordinary views
18 that I know of in Washington state? And all of
19 us in this county look to that view. Is it worth
20 throwing it away for a million and a half
21 dollars?

22 I'm sorry, but in the real estate business
23 that's way cheap. And if you'll sell it for a
24 million and a half, I will guarantee you I can
25 get a buyer who will pay you more.

1 Thanks.

2 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions? No? Thank you.

3 MS. BARRET: Tina Sands.

4 MS. TINA SANDS: I'm Tina Sands. I live at
5 5690 Smithson Road in Ellensburg. We live here
6 full-time. I speak on behalf of myself, my
7 husband Cliff, and my son Christopher.

8 I speak tonight because I do not want to be
9 mistaken for the silent majority mentioned in a
10 recent newspaper article. Everyone I have talked
11 with about wind turbines -- people who live near
12 and far from the proposed sites -- all tell me
13 they are opposed to them, don't support them,
14 don't expect them to be built. They don't bother
15 to speak up in opposition because they can't
16 imagine that the application will be approved.
17 This silent majority is opposed to the wind
18 turbines.

19 I'm sure there are many people here tonight
20 prepared to speak about why the turbines are a
21 bad idea altogether. We moved here five years
22 ago. I can tell you we absolutely would not have
23 bought here and sunk all our equity, blood,
24 sweat, and tears into our place here had we known
25 there would be wind developers trying to plant

1 their giant industrial turbines right in amongst
2 us.

3 The suggestion that these monstrous
4 industrial towers will not devastate our land and
5 home values and quality of life is absolutely
6 ridiculous.

7 I have talked to many people who have
8 bought, moved into their places here, only to
9 find out after the fact that there was a raging
10 debate over the placement of these turbines.
11 They were not advised in advance of the
12 applications you are considering. They have not
13 been getting the Daily Record. I have heard this
14 complaint many times.

15 We are living here now because we saw a
16 rural and peaceful environment to have our farm
17 animals and raise our son. My husband makes a
18 huge sacrifice driving to Seattle to his job
19 daily, year-round, so that we may live in this
20 quiet, rural environment. This is no small feat.
21 This is very costly in time, fuel, wear and tear
22 on himself and his vehicle. This is income from
23 outside this valley being poured into the economy
24 of this county.

25 We are not the only ones. If we wanted to

1 live in an industrial environment, such as would
2 be created by adding wind turbines in this
3 location, we could do so with a much easier
4 commute.

5 I suspect not a person in this room would
6 choose to live under or in view of those
7 industrial turbines. Those in favor of them own
8 the land they want to put them on, will be
9 compensated for having them on their land, and
10 will probably not continue to live there.

11 Perhaps some people generally support the
12 idea of wind energy, but they live elsewhere and
13 will neither have to see nor hear the roaring
14 turbines on a daily basis.

15 The appraiser for the corporation is so
16 cavalier as to say that people will just get used
17 to them, but people should not have to get used
18 to them. This is not what we bargained for when
19 we invested everything we have in this county.
20 He fails to understand that the personal
21 preference of people who buy land and move to
22 these areas is not to live with
23 industrialization. His logic is flawed at best.

24 The insurance man for the wind corporations
25 stated that they have settled mostly fire claims

1 as third-party liability for these wind turbine
2 sites. Why would we want to put fire-starting
3 turbines upwind of us in this dry and very
4 fire-prone area? As we all saw last summer,
5 water is not always available to fight these
6 fires. We've all seen in the last few summers
7 how easily fires start here and how quickly they
8 spread. These turbines can start fires, and
9 homes will be engulfed and lives destroyed, if
10 not lost, before the fire crews can even get in
11 their trucks. These turbines do not belong where
12 people live.

13 Mention was also made last evening of parked
14 haystacks and irrigation pipes in the field.
15 These are the sights one should expect to see in
16 a rural, agricultural area. Those who have fled
17 the city in this generation or in the previous
18 generation expect to live with the usual sights
19 and sounds of a rural, agricultural environment.
20 They do not expect and should not have to put up
21 with industrialization being forced upon them.

22 We have submitted our opposition to these
23 wind turbines in writing. We opposed in writing
24 and in person the previous application for the
25 turbines on Smithson Road.

1 We ask you today to exercise the wisdom you
2 did when you turned down the application for
3 turbines on Smithson. Deny the application for
4 the turbines on Highway 97. They are no more
5 appropriate there towering over and endangering
6 those residents and despoiling the extraordinary
7 beauty of the area than they are on Smithson.

8 Monstrous, noisy, dangerous turbines should
9 never be built where people live, and many people
10 live in the area where the currently considered
11 application proposes to build them. These people
12 did not bargain for life amongst industrial
13 turbines.

14 Just because you are seeing the same people
15 opposing the turbines being built amongst
16 people's homes does not negate the point that
17 these people make. This is the wrong location
18 for wind turbines.

19 Thank you for listening.

20 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you very much.

21 Do you have any questions?

22 MS. BARRET: Sandy Elliot?

23 MS. SANDY ELLIOT: I'll give my time to my
24 husband.

25 MS. BARRET: Ian Elliot?

1 MR. IAN ELLIOT: Thank you very much. I
2 won't need that much time, so I'll take it at
3 home.

4 My name is Ian Elliot, and I live at 250
5 Catlin Canyon Road in Ellensburg. My background
6 is civil engineering. I can't say that I work
7 for CH2M Hill, although I did study under Fred
8 Merrifield, who started it, down at Oregon State.

9 My testimony tonight will not deal with the
10 philosophical issues and incentives, tax
11 incentives of the wind farm project. That will
12 never stand on its own, even though that is the
13 core issue, nor will I expand on the removal
14 requirement contingency that is imperative should
15 the project not perform or not operate due to
16 market forces or lack of tax incentives.

17 Or mention except in passing that the
18 representative from Cushman & Wakefield once
19 again proved that MAI means "made as instructed."
20 He has got to be kidding that the construction of
21 a hundred million dollars' worth of industrial
22 eyesores will not affect the desirability of
23 residential real estate. What gall, I mean.

24 Instead this will itemize the issues that we
25 feel will give the Commission and also the

1 commissioners the valid reasons to disallow the
2 request for wind use overlay and development
3 contract.

4 The environmental review lead agency status
5 was denied to the County, and I believe that
6 action allows the County to deny the project
7 because either the County believes that the wrong
8 methodology was employed or that the material
9 facts were omitted or distorted to skew the
10 outcomes.

11 The questions on the State Environmental
12 Protection Act checklist are very broad and
13 require applicants to address all impacts
14 regarding the specific environmental checklist
15 item and also to ask if there are any other
16 factors that would be of significant impact.

17 If these answers are not addressed
18 adequately, the commissioners have the ability to
19 rejection the application and refer said
20 application back to the lead agency to address
21 those issues if possible.

22 View corridors: The selection of view
23 corridors is so myopic one would think that
24 Mr. Magoo was the consultant. The clever
25 graphics omitted the material fact that it is the

1 vast majority of the valley that is impacted by
2 the location of the turbines and not the adjacent
3 property owners and that the reduction of the
4 number of the units makes no impact to the
5 thousands of residents that have the ability to
6 view the project directly in the view corridor of
7 the Stuart range. Nearly every house built in
8 recent years is oriented to capitalize on that
9 vista.

10 The measured impacts with 160 towers were
11 high, and the impact after reduction is still
12 high throughout the valley. This mitigation is
13 insufficient to address the impact.

14 Lighting: Albeit the announcement of the
15 number of lights has been reduced, the issue
16 remains valid. A pilot flying VFR in marginal
17 conditions on the route from Seattle to
18 Ellensburg via Stampede Pass looking for the
19 airport at 200 knots can legally approach the
20 project in visibility of one mile and 500 feet
21 from the ground. In our notoriously foggy
22 conditions. This gives him less than 20 seconds
23 to identify and avoid multiple towers painted the
24 same color as the fog. Dicey at best.

25 The nighttime scenario is different in that

1 the directional character of the beacons is such
2 that they too must alert the same pilot in the
3 same conditions. This requires the intensity to
4 be at least valley-wide and bright enough to
5 attract the attention of the pilot. It will
6 attract your attention also, every night, all
7 night.

8 This is the beacon information. It's
9 700 watts. If you do a little math, that is a
10 longitudinal light bulb with a 42,000-watt
11 capacity (indicating) across the valley.

12 Noise: Expanding on the testimony from last
13 night, the noise levels have not been adequately
14 addressed. The noise level of this project, if
15 addressed honestly, will have to look at the same
16 levels as the new freeway across the valley. The
17 point source, 109 dBA, of the noise generator --
18 at the generator, not at the property line -- is
19 greater than that of a semi truck and trailer at
20 freeway speeds. Which is 95 dBA.

21 If I remember my acoustics from engineering,
22 every 10 dBA is twice the noise of 10 below it.
23 So if it's 95 to 105, that's twice the noise.

24 When you look at the graphs of noise, you'll
25 note that down at the bottom is the background

1 night country noise. And that is at 25 dBA. At
2 95 it isn't just proportional; it doubles every
3 10 to get up to 95. At 105 it is noisy.

4 This means that we'll have a stationary
5 noise generator equivalent to 60 very noisy
6 trucks and trailers in continuous motion. This
7 mitigation is insignificant to address the
8 impact.

9 In summation, the impacts on the noise,
10 lighting, and visual have yet to be addressed
11 adequately to mitigate the potential detriment of
12 the citizens, voters, and taxpayers of Kittitas
13 County. My wife and I urge you to reject this
14 application. Thank you very much.

15 Any questions?

16 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions? Thank you.

17 MS. BARRET: Gerry Sorenson?

18 Marilyn Sorenson?

19 Debbie --

20 MS. MARILYN SORENSON: I'm Marilyn Sorenson.
21 I live at 870 Sorenson Road, and I just say that
22 this is not the right location for the windmills.
23 I've read all the editorial, I've studied, and
24 I've listened to all the testimony, and it's just
25 not right; I'm against it.

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions anyone? Thank
2 you.

3 MS. BARRET: Debbie Boddy?

4 MS. DEBBIE BODDY: I have a new hero; all of
5 you are added to my list. This is brutal; I
6 don't know how do you this for a living.

7 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Some of them do it for
8 free.

9 MS. DEBBIE BODDY: But I do, as a citizen of
10 this county, thank you and appreciate all the
11 work you do and even just with this project. You
12 need to know that there are people that
13 appreciate you, and I'm one of them. I may not
14 agree at times, but it's a tough job.

15 Quickly, my name is Debbie Boddy. I
16 represent my husband and my family. We live on
17 790 Dudley Road in Thorp.

18 Tonight my comments -- I'm trying really
19 hard to keep personal comments out of what I want
20 to say to you. I realize the decisions you have
21 to make involve a much broader scope and the good
22 of all, so -- and you're probably -- by the time
23 I'm done you're going to wish that I had a
24 PowerPoint. I don't do well this way.

25 I did give a handout. I believe a picture

1 is worth a thousand words, so included in my
2 written statement that you received, I simply
3 printed the references that I made in my written
4 statement so that you'd have them before you.
5 And I did give them -- I did have three copies.
6 You can perhaps disburse them.

7 My comments tonight are primarily going to
8 be from legitimate organizations, Daily Record
9 articles, that kind of thing, that I believe are
10 relevant to this project and to the decision you
11 have to make.

12 Most of where I've -- my -- I started with
13 my research in the -- is it the DEIS? Or the
14 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. That
15 document was really enlightening and surprising
16 to me because it did identify impact. And of
17 course my attention was drawn to the three scenic
18 byways that were identified that will be impacted
19 in this project.

20 Before I begin with those, I thought it
21 might be relevant in terms of when something is
22 designated as a National Scenic Byway or a state
23 byway, especially when you use the term "scenic."
24 I wanted to make a distinction.

25 Webster's Dictionary defines "scenic" as

1 having to do with natural scenery affording
2 beautiful views. Now, when someone hears that
3 connotation about scenic byway, us as
4 English-speaking people are naturally going to
5 assume this definition, and you know, it's very
6 clear in our language.

7 Wind turbines, again, my conclusion with
8 their methodology for identifying scenic impact,
9 basically I concluded that beauty is in the eye
10 of the beholder. And so I -- but I want to make
11 a distinction. Wind farms perhaps are very
12 beautiful, but they are not a -- as defined in
13 this context, natural, having to do with natural
14 scenery. They are having to do with manmade
15 versus natural, as we would think as citizens and
16 English-speaking people.

17 With that in mind, I decided I'd go to,
18 well, more research and understanding. The
19 scenic byway, Mountains to Sound Greenway, I went
20 to their official website, and I wanted to know
21 what are they saying about this scenic byway.
22 And I'm reading directly from them.

23 "From the shores of Puget Sound in Seattle
24 at Alki Beach," to "the downtown waterfront, and
25 Discovery Park, to the Thorp Mill" -- I love

1 seeing Thorp -- "in Kittitas County, treasures of
2 the Northwest nature and history are easily
3 accessible and preserved as Mountains to Sound
4 Greenway, a National Scenic Byway."

5 There they clearly identified this project
6 is in a scenic -- this particular National Scenic
7 Byway.

8 Second, I -- also on their website you can
9 request -- people around the world can request
10 additional information. On there is a map,
11 clearly showing the Greenway in this case. This
12 map clearly shows that they consider where that
13 project is as part of their Greenway. And I'll
14 leave this with you. I did make a copy of it.

15 What is of interest to me in this
16 documentation is Thorp's on the map, yes, and not
17 only is Thorp on the map, it talks specifically
18 "Thorp Historic Mill and Scenic Loop," okay.

19 And it goes on to say within this document,
20 "The loop drive following the Yakima River on Old
21 Highway 10 from I-90 to (sic) Thorp and Cle Elum
22 is one of the most beautiful scenic drives along
23 the Greenway."

24 So not only in the context with their EIS,
25 they were talking about we never did anything

1 about that designation of Highway 10 being a
2 scenic byway. In this context we don't have to;
3 it's included in the national -- at a national
4 level scenic byway.

5 Also in this documentation it says "Greenway
6 Vision: Encourage preservation and
7 interpretation of" -- sorry guys, it's awful
8 getting old. Okay, "Encourage preservation and
9 interpretation of Thorp's historic character;
10 support enhancement of the local economy through
11 recreation, connection to the John Wayne Trail,
12 and creation of a local historic district."

13 Now, what I loved about this is it infers
14 that because of this byway, there is economic
15 value specifically to Thorp and to this area,
16 this area that will be impacted. So I thought,
17 wow, you know, they're referring scenic byway,
18 economy, that kind of thing.

19 So my point here is, again, this clearly is
20 demonstrating to me the land use in this case
21 has -- the primary land use besides the ag is
22 it's a scenic byway, a national, state scenic
23 byway already designated. Just by using the word
24 "scenic," when you're bringing manmade obstacles
25 in it is definitely contrary to what most

1 Americans would refer to in this.

2 My next point, it falls -- because this
3 leads into economic, I decided to go to
4 Washington State Tourism, which is the
5 "Experience Washington - The Official Site of
6 Washington State Tourism," okay? And how do --
7 why would they also include -- it's in your
8 packet. There clearly the Mountains to Sound
9 Greenway is promoted in the tourist industry.
10 And again, the official Washington state tourist
11 industry.

12 So again, when you think about this -- by
13 the way, I guess at this point I'd like to
14 mention that the EIS disclosed that there was
15 over 21,000 vehicles that travel this byway
16 daily. I believe that was in there. So if you
17 actually multiplied that, one person per vehicle
18 per day by that number by 365 days, we're talking
19 about, what, 7.6 million people a year, annually.

20 Now, when you're looking at that, the
21 tourism industry, that's a pretty significant
22 number of people impacted -- that are potential
23 impact to Kittitas and the industry there.

24 Also I wanted to -- oh, I wanted to share
25 with you in a Daily Record -- it's Thursday,

1 February 1st, 1996 -- the front page included was
2 about a, quote, "County Scenic Loop Studied."

3 "The tourist trade is already here. What we want
4 to do now is find a way to get them to stop long
5 enough to enjoy our county and spend their money
6 here."

7 Now, this particular plan, it was "A plan to
8 designate a scenic loop through Kittitas County
9 could bolster the local economy by capitalizing
10 on tourism while keeping impact to the
11 environment...a minimum, proponents of the loop
12 told the group" -- these are proponents.

13 Now, on in that particular article it said,
14 "The proposed scenic loop would veer from
15 Interstate 90 at Thorp, head northwest and hook
16 up with Highway 10, which the state designated a
17 scenic highway about 25 years ago, then on up to
18 Cle Elum."

19 This particular route they're talking about
20 is going to have -- well, I just wanted you to
21 know that they're recognizing the value of scenic
22 and economics and how it could -- the potential
23 with that.

24 Again, I think the fact that 7.6 million
25 people drive that highway way, or it's more; I

1 mean, it's obvious there's more than one person
2 in a vehicle each day. But I think the potential
3 is just tremendous and the impact is tremendous
4 for what the state and nation actually are
5 promoting.

6 Another little article -- again, just what I
7 noticed, I thought most people when they want to
8 come to Ellensburg will do a web search on -- on
9 the Chamber of Commerce. Now, I'm not -- I don't
10 know if the Chamber's for -- I think they are for
11 this.

12 But it's interesting how they promote their
13 website, because the number one thing they're
14 using is our beautiful scenery. Their -- a
15 picture on their front page, the Yakima River
16 with fishing. And again, there's dry hills up
17 above that looks very similar to the -- where
18 they want to put the wind turbines.

19 But again, a picture's worth a thousand
20 words, and the draw -- it's very clear the draw
21 that they're trying to bring is natural scenic.
22 That's not to say that in the future you could
23 have a beautiful picture of wind turbines that
24 would also be attractive. It's just it's
25 contrary to what we consider scenic byways as

1 they're defined.

2 One thing, too, I wanted to bring forward is
3 the John Wayne Trail. The number of people
4 impacted by this, people are drawn to the John
5 Wayne Trail. The DEIS talked about 167,000 --
6 over 167,000 people visit the John Wayne Trail
7 between North Bend and -- not Cle Elum; they said
8 North Bend and Thorp. Again, that trail is
9 directly below the wind turbine proposal, meaning
10 they will be impacted; it was identified and
11 there will be an impact to that. We're talking
12 about 167,000 people a year.

13 In my original document -- just -- I'm going
14 to just share what one person that enjoyed that
15 trail and why she enjoyed the trail. It
16 wasn't -- which I could relate to. And I
17 quote -- actually this was from the John Wayne
18 Trail website.

19 "We rode from South Cle Elum to Thorp. It
20 is a very reasonable surface and a very pleasant
21 ride." I think they were bicycling. "Once away
22 from Cle Elum and the highway, it was quiet and
23 scenic as one parallels the river."

24 Another quote: "This is by far the most
25 beautiful trails I have ever been on. I have

1 ridden it from North Bend to Thorp."

2 Again, these aren't people that live here;
3 these are people that the tourist industry
4 that -- they're not coming, again, for industry;
5 they're coming to get away from industry.

6 One thing, too. In November 4th, 1999, I
7 think they identified the John Wayne Trail as a
8 state park or state trail. I discovered an
9 article written in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer
10 dated November 4th, 1999, and it says, "John
11 Wayne...Trail designated" as "a national
12 Millennium Legacy Trail," which is a very
13 prestigious honor. And it goes clear -- it was
14 nominated for that honor by Governor Locke, and
15 it was approved by the White House Millennium's
16 Program.

17 So what was interesting to me is our John
18 Wayne Trail that we talk about all the time is
19 recognized at very high levels in our government,
20 including governors and presidents. So I love
21 that that there is that recognition and that the
22 value that it adds to what -- just putting these
23 natural resources into perspective and the number
24 of people that are interested in our natural
25 resources.

1 The third point I wanted to make, and I
2 know -- I guess you've heard many people talk
3 about history repeating itself and the ugly power
4 pole issue, and I am not going to come up and
5 give you hearsay on that. I did manage to find
6 research I believe -- please be patient -- I
7 believe this is a relevant history lesson for you
8 for the decision you have to make now.

9 Number one, with that history lesson, with
10 these kind of processes, you're never going to
11 hear from that silent majority of people is out
12 there, that they do have opinion. You'll
13 probably never hear from them through this
14 process.

15 However, why this is a relevant point with
16 these power pole issues, I'll start in with the
17 Daily Record and Monday, March 18th, 1996, front
18 page. "Ugly, ugly, ugly." We're talking about
19 12 power poles that were constructed that were
20 110 feet high. Okay?

21 Now, why are they calling them ugly, you
22 know, why? Why "Ugly, ugly, ugly"? Let me just,
23 again, from that same edition, "Part of the
24 Ellensburg skyline, and especially the look of
25 Central Washington University's campus, are about

1 to be ruined forever by 12 huge steel poles that
2 were put in place..."

3 It goes on to say, "The view of the Stuarts
4 that is familiar to thousands of residents and
5 non-residents has been marred." Go on to say,
6 "Views of the campus and the Stuart range are
7 probably not high priorities with the bean
8 counters and contractors, but they are high
9 priorities with the average citizen of this
10 lovely valley..."

11 "The argument" -- here's my point -- "The
12 argument that residents had plenty of time to
13 object to the poles during the environmental
14 review period is irrelevant. No one could have
15 read the plans and envisioned how ugly these
16 poles" would be.

17 Now, that particular publication, there's
18 many more there; I just didn't want to take the
19 time to try to find them. But what I did find,
20 too, is in the Colombian in Vancouver,
21 Washington, carried these articles. So we're
22 talking about newspapers now far beyond us but
23 were interested in this particular issue. And
24 we're actually seeming to be an advocate for
25 those protesters.

1 And let me quote from this particular
2 edition. "Newly erected steel poles, towering
3 110 feet tall, have some residents of" the
4 "college town furious," okay.

5 Other quotes: In a letter published to the
6 Daily Record, the poles were described as a
7 "desecration of our valley." We're talking about
8 12 poles. That project is far beyond the scope
9 of 12 poles.

10 Another quote in this particular
11 publication: "'Horror!' they wrote. 'It reminds
12 us of the horror along I-90 between here and
13 Cle Elum, where you top a ridge and see perhaps
14 the most beautiful panorama in our state terribly
15 blemished by huge power poles and lines.'"
16 They're talking about those transmission lines,
17 of course.

18 Another publication of the Colombian, dated
19 April 21st.

20 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Excuse me, is this --
21 Right here.

22 MS. DEBBIE BODDY: Oh, I'm sorry.

23 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I'm sorry. Is this
24 basically another article on the same --

25 MS. DEBBIE BODDY: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Could we just simply --

2 MS. DEBBIE BODDY: Point made.

3 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Our typist is -- her
4 fingers are starting to get --

5 MS. DEBBIE BODDY: I'm sorry --

6 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Go ahead and finish up if
7 you don't mind, though, please.

8 MS. DEBBIE BODDY: One quick thing here
9 Because of this, again, residents didn't speak
10 out during these kind of processes. In fact, I
11 was there, I worked with the project manager,
12 Dick Brown. When the first committee like this
13 was set up, three people showed up. Okay? 3000
14 signatures, once they were constructed, went --
15 came forward.

16 Again, my point is, you're not hearing from
17 the majority here on industrial-size projects
18 like this.

19 My last point I wanted to make that was not
20 included in the EIS that I could see was I
21 discovered, you know, it's -- directly borders
22 the Swauk Creek, and I thought, well, that used
23 to be the Taneum ranch, and I wasn't sure what it
24 was called, so I did a web search on just Swauk
25 Creek in Ellensburg. What I found was a thousand

1 acres of Swauk Creek valley are protected by an
2 international nature conservancy. So this
3 particular project directly borders this nature
4 conservancy. And again, it's clearly Swauk Creek
5 valley between Cle Elum and Ellensburg.

6 I would encourage you perhaps to consider
7 that issue or it should maybe be addressed at
8 some point in your study or their study, the
9 impact to an international nature conservancy.

10 I guess in closing -- sorry to be so long;
11 I'm really sorry. Because I've worked with
12 project managers on multi-million-dollar
13 projects, the scope of this, again, someone else
14 made the reference, and I do encourage you as
15 well, this to me looks like Phase 1 of the
16 project. And you do need to be sure that if
17 there was a Phase 2, have you clearly opened the
18 door so that there's no process for a Phase 2;
19 and if you do open that door to them, be sure
20 that there's a clear process of what you do.

21 And again, I know you're just making your
22 recommendation to the governor, but I highly
23 encourage you, the residents of this valley are
24 impacted. There's millions of King County and
25 other residents of this state that will be

1 impacted by this decision and this recommendation
2 that you make. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Any questions? No.

4 Did you get an opportunity to say everything
5 you wanted to say? I didn't mean to cut you
6 short.

7 MS. DEBBIE BODDY: No, did I talk -- sorry.

8 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Okay.

9 MS. DEBBIE BODDY: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you. We have about
11 an hour, approximately an hour yet to go, so I
12 think we'll have about a ten-minute break now and
13 run maybe to 10:00, 10:15 or so.

14 (A break was taken.)

15 CHAIRMAN BLACK: It must be about 9:15?

16 MR. PIERCY: 9:23.

17 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Nine --

18 MR. PIERCY: 9:23.

19 CHAIRMAN BLACK: 9:23. We'd like to run
20 possibly another hour, but before we do that,
21 could we get a show of hands of how many still in
22 the audience that wish to testify.

23 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Well that, solves that
24 problem. We will be looking at tomorrow evening,
25 I'm sure.

1 So Chairman Bowen, are you --

2 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Let's continue. And I
3 just -- we've done really well on our -- kind of
4 getting our points out there and being concise;
5 and if we can continue to do that for everybody,
6 that would be great. That way we can guarantee
7 we can get done tomorrow night as well. So don't
8 want to cut anybody off or --

9 We don't want to cut people off or anything,
10 but let's try and go ahead and be precise in what
11 it is we're trying to get across. So hand us any
12 hard copies that you have and we'll all read the
13 record, so.

14 Encourage you to do what you can to make
15 sure we get the information but to be precise in
16 your comments. Appreciate it.

17 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I would second that also.
18 I think it's important that we get all the
19 testimony from both sides and we, we really don't
20 want to cut anyone off, we don't want to set a
21 time limit; but looking at the number of hands,
22 if we could speed the operation up a little bit,
23 it might be helpful.

24 In any event, let's go to the next person.

25 MS. BARRET: Bernice Best.

1 MS. BERNICE BEST: Good evening. My name is
2 Bernice Best. My family and I reside at 210
3 Tomahawk Lane. That is in the Green Canyon area,
4 the northeast corner of the boundary of the
5 proposed project. I represent myself and my
6 husband, my grandson, and my son, and the
7 Rock 'N' Tomahawk Ranch.

8 We purchased our property in 1988, moved
9 over to the Valley in 1990. And until he was
10 injured on the job, my husband commuted back and
11 forth. My son still commutes to Seattle to work
12 in order to maintain the type of living that we
13 want to live, away from people. Not that I don't
14 like people; it's just that I don't want to live
15 close to them.

16 But a couple things I want into the record.
17 I overheard a conversation last night, a person
18 saying that people that are in favor of wind
19 farms must have property or tend to have a
20 monetary value for wind farms on their property.
21 That's not the case with us. We anticipate no
22 revenue from a wind machine on our property. And
23 we still like them.

24 The other comment that was made was that
25 people that were in favor of wind farms were

1 crazy. I have not been certified as crazy, so
2 I'll let that stand there.

3 We did, when we purchased our property, try
4 to make it a paying operation. Went through the
5 conditional use permit recommended for guided
6 horse ride business as well as a Native American
7 campground. The campground didn't get off the
8 ground. We operated with the horse rides for
9 seven years. Right now the only income we've got
10 coming off the land is my blue agate rock
11 permits, which I just about pay property tax with
12 what I make off of that.

13 That said, my talk tonight is mainly about
14 the scenic views and the way I see and feel about
15 the views that are there. And "scenic view," a
16 term quite often used in the real estate industry
17 and by persons determined to hinder or stop
18 projects they're opposed to, this term is often
19 used by the persons opposed to the Kittitas
20 Valley Wind Power Project.

21 And what is a scenic view? My -- I think my
22 Merriam-Webster dictionary's just a little bit
23 older than the young lady before me. It does not
24 have that combination of words. But it does have
25 "scenic" and it does have "view." And "scenic"

1 is defined as a view or picturesque view of a
2 landscape. And "view" is a sight, as of a
3 landscape, regarded for its pictorial quality. I
4 love pictures of wind machines, so there you go.
5 It's really -- again, it's in the eyes of the
6 beholder.

7 When the first humans set foot in the
8 Kittitas Valley, the view was a landscape with no
9 sign of human activity. Certainly much different
10 from what it currently is. The first changes
11 were subtle and gradual. Then our European
12 ancestors arrived on the scene, causing dramatic
13 changes in the view. In the 1900s the scene
14 began to change much faster, to what it currently
15 is.

16 That being said, let's look at the current
17 view in the area of concern. Notwithstanding
18 the rolling hills, valleys, flora, fauna, and of
19 course the beautiful Stuart mountain range --
20 visible to some; I'm too close to that range, I
21 don't see it, only when I'm coming home from
22 town -- that view also includes six large sets of
23 high voltage transmission lines; several power
24 lines running in many directions; fences, many in
25 dire need of repair; numerous roads and many

1 buildings and homes, some of which have huge
2 lights that are left on all night. I'm not quite
3 sure just what part of that view these people are
4 concerned about being obstructed.

5 With the setback, very little of the
6 landscape would be obscured from view, though I
7 wonder just how much time is actually being spent
8 sitting around looking at the scenic view.

9 With the project being proposed to occupy
10 approximately 6000 acres, the vastness of the
11 land would most certainly diminish the size of
12 the turbines, thereby lessening the impact on the
13 view, while adding, in my opinion, another
14 interesting feature to it. I feel the
15 possibility of increasing tourism is very likely,
16 as people actually are interested in wind
17 machines and the production of clean energy.

18 We can never go back to what the Kittitas
19 Valley once was. We should be thankful that our
20 valley homes and land are not covered with water
21 to meet the demand of the electrical power, which
22 has been the case in other areas in the past.

23 The sacrifice of some scenic view is nothing
24 compared to what others have given up for the
25 common good. The need for the electrical power

1 will increase as the population in the Pacific
2 Northwest, including the Kittitas Valley,
3 continues to expand. We need to be ready to meet
4 that need with a variety of power sources.

5 As for the loss of property values, there's
6 no proof of long-term loss of property values.
7 That is an assumption based on speculation and
8 not fact. Scenic views are just one of the many
9 requirements used to set property values by the
10 tax assessor's office, if it exists, be sure that
11 property and tax values will increase
12 accordingly.

13 I personally feel that persons worried about
14 property values decreasing are not really
15 interested in the Kittitas Valley; rather, they
16 are interested in the resale value of their
17 property so they can profit, which is not
18 necessarily a bad thing, and move on.

19 And I do want to mention there was talk
20 about sales of property there. We purchased
21 quite a bit of property, have sold some to
22 partners at one time. The first of last year we
23 had over 200 acres. We sold an 80-acre parcel.
24 We paid \$20,000 for that acre -- that 80 acres.
25 We sold it for 65,000 cash. And I made very sure

1 that these people knew about the wind machines.
2 They were not concerned. They bought it anyhow.
3 It's for recreation. They have horses, and the
4 wind machines didn't bother them at all.

5 Thank you very much for your time and this
6 opportunity to speak.

7 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions?

8 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Can I --

9 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Go ahead.

10 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Thank you.

11 Can you tell me a little bit about the
12 characteristics of the area, and what have you
13 seen in terms of development in the area?

14 MS. BERNICE BEST: There's some building,
15 there are two permanent -- one permanent home and
16 a summer cabin straight up above us. We're there
17 full-time. There's one person that's at the end
18 of the upper Green Canyon Road that has a ranch
19 there, 50 acres.

20 Straight up where Green Canyon Road ends
21 there's the Green Canyon Ranch, which is used
22 strictly as recreation property. It has a huge
23 house and barns and everything else. And it's
24 just recreation; they don't live there full-time.

25 There's two other houses along the property

1 on upper Green Canyon Road. And then right up on
2 Green Canyon and Reecer there's a home, and then
3 there's several homes on the Reecer Creek side in
4 that area.

5 There are a few recreational spots for
6 trailers and things, where people come up now and
7 then. So that's just on my side right there. So
8 I'm -- I don't get over the hill much to see
9 what's on the other side. Okay?

10 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Thank you.

11 MS. BARRET: Helen Wise.

12 MS. HELEN WISE: My name is Helen Wise. I
13 live at 1106 East Third Avenue in Ellensburg.
14 I'm here for myself and for the generations to
15 come. And there's several of them already here.

16 I came here in 1953. Next summer I will
17 have been here 53 years. And let me tell you, I
18 have seen some changes; and you have no idea, if
19 you haven't lived here that long, how much
20 different it is. It's a beautiful valley. It's
21 never going to be other than a beautiful,
22 beautiful valley.

23 As you are listening to us as we make our
24 comments and then make your deliberations and
25 recommendations later, I urge you to be

1 objective. Whether a person thinks a wind
2 turbine is a work of art or not is really a
3 subjective matter. And it should not be a part
4 of this deliberation and decision.

5 I think they're beautiful. Lots of people
6 that I know think they're beautiful. They're
7 graceful, and they don't -- the turbines -- or
8 the blades don't go around rapidly. When you're
9 watching them it's almost a soothing, hypnotic
10 effect. And I've been at the base of turbines.
11 You can stand there and talk and be heard by your
12 companion. Anyway, beauty is, as has been said
13 many times tonight, beauty is in the eye of the
14 beholder.

15 Now, as I say, I love the looks of these,
16 the gracefulness and all that. But I would not
17 stand here and ask you to allow these turbines
18 for the wind farm to be put out there just so I
19 could enjoy them, could enjoy their gracefulness
20 and all that. It seems that it should work both
21 ways. The decision should not be made on whether
22 I like to look at them or somebody else doesn't
23 like to look at these -- at the turbines.

24 I haven't really heard much about anything
25 but what is happening now. This is, as they used

1 to say, bigger than both of us. We have to look
2 to the future, and that's why I say I'm concerned
3 about this project as it relates to the future of
4 this community, this valley, this state, this
5 region. In fact, the whole world.

6 On a national and international level, the
7 clean generation of electricity is necessary to
8 help reduce the emission of gases that lead to
9 global warming. And that we're really seeing the
10 effects of it, and you can't just turn that off,
11 but you can slow down the increase of global
12 warming.

13 As a renewable resource, wind energy helps
14 free us from dependence on the more finite -- the
15 finite fuels: coal, oil, gas. On the local
16 level and on the state levels, wind projects
17 bring jobs, income from land leases, economic
18 development, and state and local taxes.

19 Directly and indirectly Kittitas Valley Wind
20 Power Project means benefits to all of us,
21 whether you like to look at them or not.

22 The Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project
23 addendum to the Draft Environmental Impact
24 Statement was prepared by the Energy Facility
25 Site Evaluation Council, which includes a

1 representative from our county. It's not just
2 that we're out of this altogether. It includes
3 that representative, it -- as well as
4 representatives from four Washington state
5 departments and one state commission, plus a
6 chairman.

7 Every effort has been made to address the
8 concerns expressed in both written and oral
9 comments presented at public hearings held here
10 in Ellensburg, and including the reduction of the
11 number of turbines by almost 50 percent.

12 The spokesman for the Residents Against
13 Kittitas Turbines is quoted in the January 7th
14 Daily Record as saying, "Our main issue, as it
15 always has been, is that this is an inappropriate
16 site for an industrial wind farm, whether it has
17 20 or 200 turbines."

18 Now, before considering whether the site is
19 appropriate, note that Chapter 6 in the
20 Comprehensive Plan -- it's Utilities -- and it
21 says in its definition of utilities, the supply
22 and treatment and distribution of electricity,
23 among a number of other utilities. Such
24 utilities consist of both the service activity
25 along with the physical facilities necessary.

1 So it's been referred to as industrial. The
2 Comprehensive Plan refers to this as utilities.
3 And it's there in Chapter 6.

4 So we look at the -- I've lost my spot.
5 Anyway, we're looking at Chapter 6. And there
6 are goals and they're called GPOs: goals,
7 policies, and objectives.

8 If you want to determine whether the
9 Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project is sited
10 appropriately from the standpoint of the
11 Comprehensive Plan, turn to Page 3-13 of the
12 addendum. It's an attachment on the letter I
13 just gave you.

14 I have reviewed all 34 of the GPOs of that
15 chapter and not found any that would declare
16 construction of the project on the proposed site
17 inappropriate. Indeed, these GPOs support the
18 project and outline the process for permitting.

19 In the proposed Draft Environmental Impact
20 Statement it was pointed out by EFSEC that it
21 remains inconsistent with the Kittitas County
22 Comprehensive Plan until it submits its
23 application for a change, for the land use
24 consistency.

25 The first GPO in Chapter 6, the first goal

1 is, "Additions to and improvements of utilities
2 facilities will be allowed to occur at a time and
3 in a manner sufficient to serve growth." Growth
4 is coming; there's no doubt about that.

5 The process, the second -- 6.9 says,
6 Process, permits, and approval for all utility
7 facilities -- oh, excuse me, "Process permits and
8 approvals for all utility facilities in a fair
9 and timely manner, and in accordance with
10 development regulations that ensure predicability
11 and project concurrency."

12 GPO 6.18: "Decisions made" -- "Decisions
13 made regarding utility facilities should be
14 consistent with and complementary to regional
15 demand and resources and should reinforce an
16 interconnected regional distribution network."

17 The proposed project would significantly
18 reinforce an interconnected regional power
19 transmission and distribution network by
20 connecting the Puget Sound Energy's and
21 Bonneville Power Administration's power grid.

22 The GPO 6.34: "Wind farms may only be
23 located in areas designated as Wind Farm Resource
24 overlay districts in the Comprehensive Plan.
25 Such Wind Farm Resource overlay districts need

1 not be designated as Major Industrial
2 Developments..."

3 That -- such a designation requires that the
4 applicant seek a subarea Comprehensive Plan
5 amendment, which is what we're all about. The
6 docketing application for a Comprehensive Plan
7 amendment was submitted October 17th, 2005, along
8 with the request for rezone.

9 Then -- so there's a process there, and we
10 are in the midst of -- hopefully toward the end
11 of that process.

12 As you will find on Page 3-14 of the
13 addendum, and that's the attachment, these are
14 GPOs from Chapter 8 of the Comprehensive Plan.
15 It's on densities and uses of rural lands, and
16 they are quoted here.

17 GPO 8.5: "Kittitas County recognizes and
18 agrees with the need for continued diversity in
19 densities and uses in rural lands." This project
20 will not change densities in the rural lands. It
21 will not change or preclude the existing open
22 space and the agricultural uses. It will help
23 diversify the county's rural economy.

24 GPO 8.9 says, "Projects or developments
25 which result in the significant conservation of

1 rural lands or rural character will be
2 encouraged." This project is compatible with
3 traditional rural land use and is an alternative
4 to the development of residential subdivisions or
5 other uses which do not preserve or encourage
6 rural land conservation.

7 GPO 8.11 says, "Existing and traditional
8 uses should be protected and supported..."
9 Traditionally this project area and surrounding
10 lands have been used for cattle grazing and
11 recreation, which are compatible with this
12 project. Generations of electricity using wind
13 power is a relatively new rural land use which
14 is -- generates revenues to the landowners and
15 the public through the taxes and royalties paid.

16 So this is a Comprehensive Plan; these are
17 goals, and they're policies and they're
18 objectives. The Comprehensive Plan, as you well
19 know, is not something that is just pulled out of
20 thin air. You've worked enough with these things
21 to know that it was really a lot of people with
22 concerns for the community for the valley, for
23 all of us who put this together. I think that
24 you should keep these things very much in mind.

25 The remaining requirement for EFSEC approval

1 of the project is that the project be consistent
2 with the current -- the current county zoning
3 code. Sagebrush Power Partners has submitted the
4 required applications with Kittitas County to
5 become consistent with that code.

6 I urge you to recommend the approval of the
7 application for the Comprehensive Plan amendment
8 as submitted on October 17th, 2005, for a Wind
9 Farm Resource overlay along with the request for
10 rezone. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions? Thank you very
12 much.

13 MS. BARRET: Gloria Baldi?

14 MR. JAMES CARMODY: Mr. Chairman, would it
15 be possible if there are people who can't be here
16 tomorrow night that they could possibly be given
17 an opportunity to speak tonight?

18 CHAIRMAN BLACK: We tried that last night
19 and it didn't work very well, so I'm sorry, I
20 think that we should just stay with the order
21 that we are at the present time.

22 Go ahead.

23 MS. GLORIA BALDI: Commissioners, my name is
24 Gloria Baldi. I'm representing Kittitas Audubon,
25 an organization with about 130 members in the

1 Kittitas County.

2 More than three and a half years ago when
3 Zilkha -- now Horizon Wind Energy -- was
4 beginning to introduce its wind power project to
5 valley residents, Zilkha was find enough to meet
6 with Kittitas Audubon to represent its bird
7 research.

8 At that time we questioned procedures
9 involving observations over short amounts of time
10 for a period of just one year. But we were
11 informed that that was the accepted protocol.

12 From that original meeting and more strongly
13 now, Kittitas has continued to state that we feel
14 the studies are incomplete and therefore
15 inadequate. With the newness of wind power
16 development, the lethal effects are just
17 beginning to be realized to the birds and bats,
18 the latter which were not even considered at that
19 time.

20 The area of this project is a bird migration
21 flyway. Each year in the spring and the fall,
22 birds -- including many raptors, which are
23 hawks -- funnel up or down, depending on the
24 season, and they funnel up and down the canyons
25 and over the ridges in the area of this proposed

1 project. No other wind power project is located
2 on such a bird migratory flyway.

3 Additionally, no night studies have been
4 performed to determine the effects on bats or the
5 birds migrating at higher altitudes.

6 Milton-Freewater Wind Power Project was very
7 surprised that they found that they had more bat
8 kills than they had bird kills. And as I say,
9 this is brand-new research that was not even
10 known at the beginning of this project.

11 Our concerns remain for the wildlife
12 impacts; and now after more than three years of
13 expressing our reservations, these same concerns
14 are being expressed by others. Most recently the
15 Government Accounting Office, the GAO. And the
16 GAO-05-906 Report on Wind Power Impacts on
17 Wildlife and Government Responsibilities for
18 Regulating Development and Protecting Wildlife
19 reflected these same concerns. Our letter to the
20 planning office gives the website address for
21 this report.

22 And the following are some quotes that are
23 reflected in this report. No. 1 -- and this is
24 all quoted -- "Once thought to have practically
25 no adverse environmental effects, it is now

1 recognized that wind power facilities can have
2 adverse effects, particularly on wildlife and
3 most significantly on birds and bats."

4 No. 2: "Large numbers of birds and bats are
5 believed to follow and cross through many parts
6 of the United States, including along mountain
7 ridges, during seasonal migration. Consequently
8 wind power projects located in these areas could
9 potentially impact these species." A perfect
10 example is this project.

11 No. 3: "...there is a shortage of
12 information on migratory bird routes and bat
13 behavior as well as ways in which topography,
14 weather and turbine type affect mortality."

15 No. 4: "...studies conducted at one
16 location can rarely be used to extrapolate
17 potential impacts or mitigation effectiveness at
18 other locations..."

19 "It appears" --

20 And No. 5: "It appears" that new -- "when
21 new wind power facilities are permitted" -- if
22 "It appears when new wind power facilities are
23 permitted, no one is considering the impacts of
24 wind power on a regional or 'ecosystem' scale
25 that often spans governmental jurisdictions."

1 Kittitas Audubon has spoken to these
2 concerns on every proposed wind farm, and
3 although we support renewable energy, we believe
4 the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project is a
5 migratory flyway and is not in the best interests
6 of wildlife and the citizen of Kittitas County,
7 and we strongly recommend that you deny this
8 project. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions?

10 Thank you.

11 MS. BARRET: Jeb Baldi?

12 Wayne Bell?

13 Barbara Bell?

14 J.P. Roan?

15 Paul Peshusta?

16 James Carmody.

17 MR. JAMES CARMODY: Sometimes you get lucky,
18 huh.

19 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Better to be lucky than
20 good.

21 MR. JAMES CARMODY: For the record, my name
22 is James Carmody. My address is 405 East
23 Lincoln. I'm here representing the Residents
24 Opposed to Kittitas Turbines.

25 We've been at this a long time. I was here

1 during the initial Comprehensive Plan adoptions
2 in the initial Zilkha project. I've been
3 involved in the original Kittitas Valley project.
4 I've been involved in the litigation appeals on
5 the EnXco Desert Claim project through successful
6 proceedings before Judge Cooper. And I'm here
7 again. And it's always challenging and it's
8 always a challenge.

9 I want to start off by supporting the
10 comments made by your planning director,
11 Mr. Piercy, yesterday with respect to
12 environmental review.

13 The public has not had an opportunity to
14 comment upon the addendum that's been presented.
15 EFSEC is the lead agency. That element of
16 evidence hasn't been developed for you and isn't
17 before you, and the public has not had an
18 opportunity to proceed on that basis.

19 I was also frustrated last night with three
20 hours of testimony from Horizon -- I keep wanting
21 to call them Zilkha -- with materials that none
22 of us have seen. Experts that have been flown in
23 from everywhere and exited without opportunities
24 for cross-examination or comment.

25 What I would ask for you is that the public

1 and the community be given an opportunity to
2 review those materials and that testimony within
3 a reasonable period of time and provide comment
4 to you before you enter into deliberations.

5 Now, there are a few comments that I want to
6 make, and I'm going to try to move forward so
7 others can speak. But the project itself I think
8 has been lost in what you've been reviewing.
9 We've seen nice distant pictures of painted-in
10 turbines. And I think it's important to keep in
11 mind exactly what's being proposed here.

12 The turbines being proposed are 410 feet
13 tall. That's a 40-story building. The rotor on
14 the top is the same size as a Boeing 747. So you
15 are going to have eighty 747s spinning in the
16 wind in this area. They are massive. They are
17 huge. They're not little pencils painted in on
18 pictures, but they are gigantic, huge pieces of
19 equipment.

20 But there's a lot more to the project than
21 that. There's 13 miles of new roads being
22 proposed. There's improvements to seven miles of
23 existing roads. There are 23 miles of
24 underground electrical power lines. Two miles of
25 overhead electrical power lines. Two

1 substations. One 5000-square-foot operation and
2 maintenance facility, and up to nine additional
3 permanent meteorological towers. That's the
4 project. And that's what's being introduced into
5 this rural environment. And that's why people
6 are concerned.

7 That was exactly the kind of concept that
8 was dealt with in Desert Claim, and this is an
9 even more intrusive and a more sensitive
10 environment than that was.

11 One of the things that's been confusing
12 tonight and I think confusing in this process is
13 exactly what is the proposal in terms of numbers
14 of turbines. If you look at that, that's what
15 they're telling you is the project -- there's
16 65 turbines identified on that. In the materials
17 that you have there are 64 turbines identified.

18 But in their submissions, they're saying
19 their project is 80 turbines. They haven't given
20 you a site plan, they haven't given you a
21 diagram, they haven't shown you a thing as to
22 80 turbines. 16 more turbines.

23 The addendum to the Draft EIS also says that
24 with their DAA, the application, applicant now
25 brings forward a range -- the range of the middle

1 to lower end scenario as that most probably to be
2 constructed. In the DEIS there are three ranges:
3 low, medium, high. The lowest is one up to 82.

4 It goes on, says, Regardless of whether the
5 middle or lower end scenario is chosen, the
6 project would consist of no more than 80
7 turbines.

8 If you're going to evaluate it, you need
9 80 turbines. You don't have it on this map.

10 They go on to say that the turbine lines
11 that are shown there with the "X"s remain in
12 place; they just reduced the density.

13 On Page 2.4 of the DEIS it says up to
14 80 turbines would be arranged in numerous strings
15 and labeled A through J throughout the project
16 site for a maximum of 23 total miles of turbine
17 strings. The length of the nine turbine strings
18 would remain constant under the three project
19 scenarios. Only density of the turbines sited
20 with each string would change.

21 So those nine strings remain intact the full
22 distance. The only thing that changes is a
23 density.

24 You don't have a specific proposal. What
25 they propose to you is a nameplate capacity with

1 a maximum of 80 machines. The siting, the
2 locations, all of those things are for later
3 terms.

4 Now, let me put in it perspective. Mr. Peck
5 is involved in Klickitat County. I represented a
6 wind developer in Klickitat County, Windtricity.
7 We proposed a project with identical machines,
8 virtually identical size, and had it approved in
9 Klickitat County. Interestingly, in contrast to
10 this, in contrast to this, not one neighbor
11 showed up for the hearings.

12 And that gets to the point of what you have
13 to decide, what your Comprehensive Plan puts in
14 place. It's a locational chase. This isn't
15 about whether wind farms are good, wind energy is
16 good, renewable energy is good; everyone would
17 agree to that.

18 But locational choices are what this is all
19 about. You made that locational choice at Wild
20 Horse, and I believe that was a correct
21 locational choice. You denied it at Desert
22 Claim, and I believe that was appropriate.

23 And one of the things that you denied it on
24 at Desert Claim was aesthetic impacts, the
25 interrelationship with existing residential uses

1 and occupancies and the huge size and magnitude
2 of this project. And that EIS said those were
3 unavoidable impacts.

4 Interestingly, the DEIS in this case has
5 exactly the same finding. 3-28 of the addendum
6 says the revised KVVPP layout will not create
7 additional adverse impacts to visual resources.
8 With the proposed layout, the KVVPP will have
9 less impact on the visual resources than before.

10 And then it goes on to say, But those that
11 exist even on a reduced basis are unavoidable,
12 adverse impacts.

13 That's your environmental determination.
14 That was one of the bases for denial on Desert
15 Claim in terms of consistency. That same ruling
16 and determination should apply in this case.

17 You've heard a lot about shadow flicker,
18 noise. The comments, Mr. Williamson, that you
19 made were exactly appropriate. There are
20 methodologies. And you can take a noise source
21 and you can reduce it simply by distance.

22 One of the problems you have here with noise
23 is you have no way to mitigate that other than
24 distance. You can't build a wall. Noise'll go
25 straight. If you've got it coming from up here

1 down, you can't build walls, you can't build
2 barriers; trees don't do anything.

3 And that formula can be -- can be put
4 together; and with some opportunity, we could
5 provide that information to you along with the
6 people at the university. But it won't mitigate
7 in that area.

8 The comments earlier on noise about the
9 doubling with each 10 dB increase is absolutely
10 right. Years ago we did the gravel mine on the
11 top of Horse Canyon, and some of you'll recall
12 the noise studies that were done there.

13 The ambient -- the ambient noise levels
14 measured at that time were in the upper 40s
15 range. Every 10-dB increase over that doubles
16 it, so going from 48 to 58 is a doubling of
17 noise. 58 to 68 is another doubling. So it's an
18 exponential function.

19 Just think what you get in terms of noise
20 increase when you get up to 108 dBAs, which is
21 what we're starting with on this project.

22 That information can be developed. There's
23 also information in the Desert Claim EIS, which
24 Mr. Piercy urged you to review.

25 I'm not going to go through the shadow

1 flicker. I want to talk about a couple other
2 quick points. I thought one of the more
3 interesting comments from the experts last night
4 was on insurance. Because he told you on one
5 that there's going to be no insurance claims or
6 haven't been very many claims made, yet he also
7 told you that FERC requires a minimum insurance
8 level, \$20 million.

9 Now, if these things aren't risky, if they
10 don't pose liability potentials, if there's not a
11 problem with them, why in the world are you
12 having a \$20 million minimum insurance policy
13 required?

14 And the reason is because they have major
15 potentials to create problems. Your record is
16 filled with that throughout.

17 There's been talk to you about all the money
18 that's going to be generated to the county and
19 the comments on sales tax. But more importantly,
20 the money isn't site-specific-driven. That money
21 will come with a properly located wind farm in
22 this community. It doesn't go away; you get it
23 with Wild Horse. You can get it in Vantage.

24 So it's not a choice of saying "I'm turning
25 away those dollars." Those dollars exist on a

1 project-specific locational basis. So that's --
2 that's a misnomer and misleading.

3 You're not getting anything on employment on
4 this thing. What is it, three, four, five people
5 at most employed?

6 The final thing I want to take and make a
7 comment on, as someone said, you know, you don't
8 need a Ph.D. in common sense. And this is pretty
9 common sense, pretty straightforward, pretty
10 simple, in my mind. I did grow up here. I know
11 it always bothered my dad when he sat in your
12 shoes and people from out of town came and said,
13 Yeah, I understand Kittitas Valley because I used
14 to live here and that.

15 But I grew up here, my family's here. It's
16 a special place, it's a special valley. And no
17 matter how you cut it, you put in eighty 40-story
18 turbines in that court, you're gutting the core
19 of this valley.

20 Think about -- what do you think about the
21 hills around Kennewick when you look up on the
22 turbines? Do you think they're nice hills, do
23 you enjoy that, or do you just, jeez, there's
24 turbines there. Or going to Walla Walla or other
25 places. That becomes the mind-set.

1 You have something special to preserve. You
2 have done something special in this community, in
3 this valley, with Suncadia. There's a reason
4 people like this, there's a reason people come
5 here to live, there's a reason for that
6 environment.

7 And that's what's preserved; that's the
8 world component that you preserve, in my
9 judgment, not wind farms. And preserve that for
10 the people, preserve that for posterity. How
11 many times have we heard: I'm the third or
12 fourth generation here? Let that -- let that
13 carry through. Give that opportunity and
14 preserve that sort of special corridor.

15 I think Steve Lathrop made a comment, I
16 think one of the earlier times when we were here,
17 about the county logo and what it's a picture of.
18 It's the Stuart range. I urge you to protect it.
19 There's a place for wind farms. There's plenty
20 of opportunities here. Believe it or not, this
21 is not the only place in the world the wind
22 blows. It blows in Klickitat County, it blows in
23 Benton County, it blows in Franklin County, it
24 blows in Walla Walla County. And it blows here.
25 But do it in the right way.

1 I appreciate all the time that you've taken
2 on this and urge you, please, to reject this
3 particular project. Thanks.

4 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions? Thank you very
5 much.

6 10:15.

7 MS. BARRET: One more? Okay. I did miss
8 Jeb Baldi, pardon me.

9 MR. JEB BALDI: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN BLACK: 10:15. Do we want to go
11 longer?

12 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Let's go ahead, take Jeb,
13 see where we're at when he's done.

14 MR. JEB BALDI: Thank you. My name is Jeb
15 Baldi, and I live here in town.

16 I'd like to -- the following questions for
17 both the commissioners and the Planning
18 Commission, I'd like to you answer these
19 questions to yourself and take a minute of
20 consideration when you're making your
21 determination on the Horizon Wind Energy proposal
22 along Highway 97.

23 The first question is, why do we have to
24 sacrifice our landscape for the more populated
25 areas of Washington? Wind development farms

1 could just as well be placed along the shores of
2 Puget Sound as in this valley. And without the
3 cost of transmission lines.

4 Why must we keep finding the wind farm
5 corporations time and time again when the
6 majority of the landowners in this valley don't
7 want these monstrous machines?

8 Why must we continue to listen to these
9 out-of-state developers that plan to spoil our
10 quality of life? Tax incentives allow them to
11 build and to leave with their pockets full of
12 money.

13 Very few people in this valley will benefit
14 financially, while all the others will lose their
15 viewscape.

16 Why not consider conservation? Projections
17 for all the proposed wind developments in
18 Kittitas County will produce about 1 percent of
19 the state's energy needs. With incentives on
20 conservation, 1 percent could easily be obtained
21 and would not spoil our beautiful valley.

22 As just mentioned before me, we are not the
23 only place in this state or in this nation that
24 has wind. Washington state doesn't show up on
25 the top 15 windiest places in the nation.

1 Every six months or so we come to the
2 fairgrounds, we sit for hours, we listen to the
3 same material. Yes, the industry does send
4 different players, and yes, we have different
5 members on the county board from time to time.
6 However, it's same hashing of the same materials
7 over and over.

8 The developers have the most to gain, the
9 local community has the most to lose. Each and
10 every hearing the majority oppose wind
11 development. But we are forced to keep coming
12 back. What happened to democracy?

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN BLACK: Questions? Thank you very
15 much.

16 It's 10:20.

17 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Do you want to wrap it up
18 for today?

19 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I think we should. I
20 apologize to those that are out in the audience.
21 I hope you can all attend the next meeting, but
22 it's starting to get pretty late.

23 So I would entertain a motion to continue
24 this meeting until tomorrow evening, 6:30 in this
25 building.

1 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: So moved.

2 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'll second.

3 CHAIRMAN BLACK: It's been moved and
4 seconded that we continue this public hearing
5 until tomorrow, 6:30 p.m., July -- January --
6 that's a long time. A long, long time.

7 January 12th. 6:30, this room. All in
8 favor?

9 COMMISSIONER HARRIS: Aye.

10 COMMISSIONER McCLAIN: Aye.

11 COMMISSIONER PERNA: Aye.

12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Aye.

13 COMMISSIONER WILLIAMSON: Aye.

14 CHAIRMAN BLACK: I too vote aye.

15 Opposed?

16 Motion carries.

17 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I would move to continue
18 this public hearing to January 12th, 6:30 p.m.,
19 here at the Kittitas County Events Center, Home
20 Arts building. The record will remain open to
21 both verbal and written testimony.

22 COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: It's been moved and
24 seconded to continue this public hearing to
25 January 12th, 6:30 p.m., here in the Kittitas

1 County Events Center.

2 Any discussion to the motion?

3 COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Mr. Chairman, I
4 believe it was pointed out last night that there
5 may be a conflicting event in the city with the
6 City of Ellensburg Comp Plan review tomorrow
7 night. That's something we should take into
8 consideration.

9 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: That was brought up by
10 someone who I believe testified here this
11 evening. I didn't hear any other comments on
12 that. I don't know if Commissioner Huston has
13 any feedback on that or direction.

14 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: The list of conflicts
15 is endless; I suggest we forge ahead.

16 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: Any further discussion
17 regarding that?

18 Hearing none, all those in favor of the
19 motion indicate by saying aye.

20 COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH: Aye.

21 COMMISSIONER HUSTON: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN BOWEN: I too will vote aye, and
23 the motion carries. Thank you all very much.

24 (The proceeding was adjourned at
25 10:25 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss.
COUNTY OF YAKIMA)

This is to certify that I, Louise Raelene Bell, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, residing at Yakima, reported the within and foregoing hearing; said hearing being taken before me as a Notary Public on the date herein set forth; that said hearing was taken by me in shorthand and thereafter under my supervision transcribed, and that same is a full, true and correct record of the hearing.

I further certify that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I financially interested in the outcome of the cause.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this _____ day of _____, 2005.

LOUISE RAELENE BELL, CCR
CCR No. 2676
Notary Public in and for the
State of Washington, residing at
Yakima. My commission expires
July 19, 2007.